THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

AND THE

ENGLISH GOVERNING CLASS

1815 - 1867.

BY

ARTHUR Mervyn KEPPEL-JONES.

Ph. D. 1943 University of Cape Town.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1.

THE TRANSITION IN ENGLISH SOCIETY.

The British constitution with its many imperfections has in our time seemed worthy of being defended by the valour of heroes. Foreign nations, and British communities in distant lands, have reproduced its features in the hope of thereby ripening and securing their own liberties. But too often this system, which in Britain survives the strain of total war, withers even in peace when transplanted to other political climates. This happens because the British constitution has grown up in harmony with the British social structure, and it cannot flourish where the social system is uncongenial to it.

Historically speaking, the British constitution is no more than an enlargement of the English constitution; it grew up in England, without regard to the needs of Scotland or Ireland and before the legislative union of the British Isles. With the exception of the cabinet system, all the essentials of the structure were in existence by 1707. Scotland and Ireland must needs accept the system as it stood, reconciling the common constitution with their own social systems as well as possible. After the unions, more than three-quarters of the members of the House of Commons represented England and Wales; the English social system continued to set the pace for the whole. Wales, of course, is not England; but the political union between them is so close and so old that it is hardly possible to separate them in a social history. The present study is therefore

intended to be a partial one - a study of the English social background to the British constitution. Scotland and Ireland have had a common political, but not a common social history with England, and they will be left out of this picture.

The period taken - from 1815 to 1867 - is that in which the great transition in modern English society and politics was begun, though not completed, and it is chosen because the beginning of every change is the most important part to understand.

The problem set is this: why did the Industrial Revolution in England, unlike the political revolution in France, bring about no cataclysmic shift of power from one class to another, and of influence from one set of ideas to another; but merely a gradual, almost imperceptible change, in which there was at no time any social iconoclasm or deliberate forsaking of the old traditions? This question has a manifold importance. The constitution proved adaptable. It had a capacity for stability, something about it which did not <u>date</u>, but was suited as well to one age as another. And if the constitution had such a common thread running through all its development, so also must the society on which it was based have had one. The possibility of the evolutionary, as opposed to revolutionary, development of society is contained in the answer to this question. Marx based the case for a proletarian revolution on the analogy with a previous bourgeois revolution. If, then, England muddled through without a bourgeois revolution, the implication is obvious.

Before the great reform of 1832 it was generally assumed

that there existed in England a "governing class". This had its hands on all the controls of the political machine. The great argument in 1831-2 was over the question whether or not the reform would deprive this class of its power. The ensuing general election did little to clear up this uncertainty, and it would be difficult to find any date in the nineteenth century when the question can be said to have been finally answered. Before the end of the century, however, it had become evident to everyone that the governing class, if it existed, was no longer what it had been. These vague assumptions, namely that there had once been a glorious aristocratic upper class, and that it had since 1832, or since some other date, been diluted by the upsurging of a mob of vulgar nouveaux riches, will be the chief subject of investigation in the present chapter.

A few words of definition must be said here. The terms "governing class" and "upper class" have been used. The people who exercise political power are not necessarily a governing class, because they may not be a class at all. By "class" in the social, as distinct from the economic sense, we shall mean a group of families who have, actually or potentially, social intercourse with one another, who may intermarry (this is the acid test, as we shall see), who share, in a general way, the same tastes, manners, and way of living. If all the people who enjoy political power have these things in common, they are a governing class; if not, then no governing class can be said to exist.

Even if there were no governing class, there would in almost any society necessarily be an upper class. This term is

used socially without reference to politics. These are the people who, being a class in the above sense, consider themselves, and are considered by others, to be the best element in society. Their way of living, their ideas, their tastes and manners are considered worthy of imitation by others, and to associate with them is considered the highest aim of social intercourse. We shall therefore look for an upper class in the English society of the early nineteenth century; try to define it; see whether it continued to exist in 1867; and, if so, whether its composition had changed. In the next chapter the same investigation will be made in political terms; in terms, that is, of the governing class, and we shall see whether there is any correlation between the social and the political phenomena.

No one will doubt that English Society in 1815 was divided into strata the distinctions between which were considered at the time to be of the greatest importance. The literature of that age teems with references to "the upper classes", "the upper ranks", "the middle classes", "persons in a middling way of life", "the lower orders", "the poor", and many more terms of the same kind. Can these phrases be clearly defined? Could the committee of Almack's have put any given person into one of these categories with certainty and no possibility of a mistake? Or at least - for this is what concerns us - could they have drawn a clear line which distinguished the upper classes on one side from the generality on the other?

To anticipate, we shall say that they could not have done so unless the term "upper class" were used with reference to

some particular defined purpose, such as: the purpose of distinguishing the young men whom the ladies would accept as sons-in-law; or the young men who might be asked to dinner in the season; or those who might be regarded as suitable companions for the Committee-members' sons, though not necessarily for their daughters. These categories were not all the same. And there were other distinctions of the same kind. Faced with this difficulty, or else for some other reason, the devotees of the science of heraldry have come forward with their own definition. They want a clear line of social demarcation. On one side of it they put the nobility or gentlefolk - for they make no distinction between noble and gentle - and on the other the "simple" or commonalty. The ticket of admission to the gentle class is a coat-of-arms. This claim may be fortified by reference to a case in the Earl Marshal's court in 1637: a gentleman is a man entitled to bear a coat-of-arms.[1] Let us at once dispose of this definition as unsuitable to our purpose. It may have been true in 1615 that every member of the upper class was entitled to bear a coat-of-arms. But the converse was certainly not true, because the rule of primogeniture had throughout all English history condemned most younger sons to push their fortunes independently of t...

---

1 A.C.Fox-Davies : The Art of Heraldry (1904), pp 9-10.

the landed heritage of the family, and with varying success. The heralds, on the other hand, cared nothing for primogeniture but accorded the family arms to all the sons. So a younger son of a younger son of a younger son would be armigerous, but might well be as poor as a church mouse and have nothing whatever to do with the upper class. [1]

The heralds having fallen short, we must think in economic terms. It is natural that within any one occupation the families which regularly provide employers and owners should take a higher social rank than those whose members are usually in a dependent position. In most urban pursuits there is, as we shall see, a fluctuation in fortunes which makes it difficult to fix the status of any family in a permanent way. But the English countryside offered a different picture. There was only one occupation - agriculture. Property was immovable property, and the relationship of a family to its property was likely to be much more stable (as everything is more stable in the country) than would be possible in a town. We shall look at the stratification of rural society, leaving the townsmen out of consideration for the present.

---

1 One example: William Gifford, editor of the Quarterly Review, was the son of a humble artisan, but his great-great-grandfather had been a landed proprietor. Dissipation had caused the decline. (D.N.B. XXI, p.308). We have here anticipated our definition, and must ask the reader to take it on trust till we come to explain it.

To observers in 1815 and thereabouts the classification of country society seemed a simple matter. First there was the landowner, or gentleman, who owned the land. Then there was the farmer, who rented a farm from the owner, and lastly the labourer, who worked for the farmer. Although the landlord would be an active agriculturist on his own home farm, the line dividing him from the farmer was quite clear. "Many gentlemen, however", says a writer of 1813, "as well as farmers, feed a considerable number both of cattle and sheep."[1] The farmer lived in a farmhouse. The gentleman's house was a seat.[2] Books were embellished with engravings of "gentlemen's seats". Between 1818 and 1826 J.P.Neale published a nine-volume book of illustrations called Views of the Seats of Noblemen and Gentlemen in England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland. These were but a very small selection. There were many more seats than could be contained in his volumes.

The threefold distinction of country Society was hereditary. The farmer's son normally became a farmer, even though he might not inherit his father's farm; or else he went to the town. The labouring poor continued at their work from one generation to the next, and the gentleman's eldest son

---

[1] J. Nightingale: Beauties of England, Vol.XIII, pt. II, p. 745

[2] For a casual reference, ibid, p.741.

son inherited the family estate.

The exceptions and anomalies which distort this picture are not very difficult to account for. Firstly there were the yeomen freeholders, farmers who were landowners at the same time. They did not hire their land from a landlord on a precarious tenure. They voted at County elections. Of course the yeoman held less land than a gentleman would hold. His house was not pretentious enough to be called a seat. But where was the dividing line between yeomen and gentlemen? Were there not many doubtful cases on the borderline?

There were such cases, but they did little to blur the otherwise sharp distinction. In 1815 and the following decade or two the class of small landowners was undergoing a rapid decline A select committee of the House of Commons which reported on this subject in 1833 showed that in Wiltshire there were no landowners with incomes of between £50 and £300; similarly in Nottinghamshire and in Yorkshire, where the change is said to have taken place after the war. In the other counties, with a few exceptions, the same process was well advanced.[1] At the end of our period - in 1873 - a classification of landowners by acreage and income shows an increasing concentration of ownership. The men arbitrarily labelled "squires" owned, on the average, 1,700 acres each, while each "greater yeoman" had 500.[2] More significantly, t

---

1 Report quoted in Mantoux: The Industrial Revolution in the Eighteenth Century, p. 144 n

2 G.C.Brodrick: English Land and English Landlords, p 187. Such statistical averages may be grossly misleading. Our case will not be based on this one

the people classed as peers, greater landowners and squires, numbering 4,217, owned well over half the land of England and Wales. The rest was divided among 968,794 less fortunate owners. [1].

A prosperous yeoman hovered on the borders of gentility. Lord Brougham was a notorious pedigree-falsifier. He attributed to a former Duke of Norfolk the statement that "we Howards have sprung up only recently: but the Broughams were at Brougham in the time of Antoninus" As a matter of history the older Brougham family had died out in 1608. [2]. Lord Brougham's ancestors in the seventeenth century were thriving yeoman freeholders who owned Scales Hall, a farm in Cumberland. One Henry Brougham in 1665, at the heraldic visitation of Sir William Dugdale, claimed the right to bear arms, but the claim was rejected. In the next generation the Broughams throve sufficiently to add to their landed possessions in Cumberland another small estate. Lord Brougham's grandfather restored to this seat the name of Brougham Hall, and established a place for himself in the world of society and politics. [3]. That is how the boundary-line could be crossed.

The family of another statesman provides a variant to this theme. The great-grandfather of the first Sir Robert Peel acquired a small freehold estate, Peele Fold, in Lancashire.

1.
2 Ibid.
3 Campbell: Lives of Lord Lyndhurst and Lord Brougham, pp 214-6
Ibid. pp. 217-9

Although this estate remained in the family, the father of the first baronet was happy to raise its fortunes by becoming a manufacturer of calicoes, in which business his son followed him. The members of this family were described by one of them as "happy in a golden mean - too high for the office of constable, too low for that of sheriff".[1] It was only when the business had prospered at Tamworth that a landed property of greater value was acquired in Drayton Manor; only then the Peels became landed gentry of independent fortune, and the second Sir Robert retained through his life a Lancashire accent and provincial awkwardness to which his shyness and reticence in public life have been largely ascribed.[2]

A factor which may have seemed important to contempories in distinguishing gentleman from yeoman was the rent-roll. A yeoman farmed his own land; a gentleman might farm some, but let out most of it to tenants, whose rents provided the basis of his income. So general did this practice appear that it entered into the foundations of the economic theory built up by the classical economists in England. Land, capital and labour, with their rewards of rent, interest and wages, were the threefold necessity of the economic system as seen by men familiar with English usage. There was no confusion of land with capital, or rent with interest; and behind this distinction lay the distinction between landlord and farmer.

It is not possible to express this distinction in terms of amount of income. The gap between £50 and £300 in [illegible] c

---

[1] Sir Lawrence Peel, quoted in McCarthy: Sir Robert Peel, p.2.

[2] Thursfield: Peel, p.8.

Wiltshire, shown in 1833 by the Committee we have referred to, seems to point to £300 as being the minimum income of a landed gentleman. But the game laws, which were made for this very class, allowed guns and dogs to anyone possessing lands of inheritance worth £100 a year.[1] A writer in 1824 reckons a man a gentleman when his income reaches £150, but his wife is called his "Lady" only at £250.[2] On the other hand a knight of the shire was required to have an income (until 1838 from land alone) of £600 and a Burgess in parliament one of £300.[3] Taking these facts together we may hazard a guess that most of the poorest members of the class of gentry, in the early part of our period, had incomes of between two and three hundred pounds a year, while some may have had little more than one hundred and still been reckoned gentlemen.

Difficult to define, the line dividing yeoman from gentleman was nevertheless a sharp one. A man was on one side of it or the other. Yeomen were often proud of their status, proud of their ancient lineage, but for all that they belonged with the farmers to the rural middle class. Once the line had been crossed, Mr. Brougham and his like abandoned one society for another. They changed their habits, called upon the neighbouring gentry, married their children into gentle families, abandoned the company of farmers and the college of heralds was satisfied.

---

1 G.M.Young (ed): Early Victorian England, Vol.I, p.252.

2 Ibid, p.104.

3 E.Porritt: The Unreformed House of Commons, Vol.I, p.176.

A man who belonged, whether newly or since the Conquest, to the ranks of the landed gentry had a patriarchal responsibility towards his family. The head of such a family was an important person. He might possess the patronage of a living or two in the Church, and directly or indirectly a little influence in Whitehall. By these means his younger brothers or his younger sons could be provided for, while the eldest son inherited the whole of the landed property intact. It is hardly possible to exaggerate the importance of primogeniture for English social history. The law provided for the inheritence of land by this method in case of intestacy. Where a will was made, custom operated just as powerfully in the same direction. Daughters and younger sons derived so much of their social position, and even the consequent economic advantages, from the glory of the family name, that they would never question the justice of primogeniture. For if it had been the custom of dying landowners to divide their estates among their children, each great family would soon have been pulverised into a number of petty families, and the glory of the name would have been lost. The aim was the opposite of this: marry the heiress of many rich acres, consolidate these with your own inheritance, pass on the enlarged domain to your eldest son, and encourage him to act in the same way. [1]

The greatest enemy of this institution was the improvident youth whose gambling and other debts put his estate into the hands of creditors, or forced him to sell them. Little use in founding a family if your grandson's dissipation may undo the work!

---

[1] Almost any page of Burke's Peerage contains examples of such accumulation.

To guard against this and other similar contingencies there was the entail. By this arrangement the ownership of the land was settled upon a future generation, even, it might be, upon the unborn grandson of the actual possessor. But in each generation this settlement was undone by agreement, and the ownership transferred to a still later generation. Thus the possessor merely held the estate in trust for an unborn or infant owner, and the time never came when the owner entered into possession and could dispose of the property. In the latter part of the nineteenth century it was supposed that two-thirds or even three-quarters of the land of the United Kingdom was held subject to this kind of restriction. [1] The entail was merely a legal reinforcement for primogeniture. As Mr. Brodrick says, "by the great majority of this class, embracing the whole nobility, the squires of England, the lairds of Scotland, and the Irish gentry of every degree, Primogeniture is accepted almost as a fundamental law of nature, to which the practice of entails only gives a convenient and effectual expression." [2]

The practice did not extend to the small townsman who had bought a little land as a stand-by for his old age. Not having enough to make himself a country gentleman, he had no inducement to favour his eldest son. Such estates were often sold at the death of the owners, and the proceeds divided among the children. [3] Primogeniture was bound up with the ambition of founding, or maintaining, a county family, the nature of which is now [illegible]

---

1 Brodrick: English Land and English Landlords, p. 100 n

2 Ibid, p.99. For the whole subject, pp 98 - 100

3 Ibid

sufficiently clear. County families, squires, country gentlemen, landed gentry, were all one. Commonly, though not always, the gentleman was a lord of the manor and had a unique predominance in the village where his seat was situated.[1] The dual authority of squire and parson has often been regarded as typical of the English village, but there were of course many parishes in which there were more than one landowning gentleman.

At the gentleman's seat time was divided between farming activities, hunting and the entertainment of visitors, either neighbours or friends and relations from distant parts. These latter, having travelled far and slowly, made a prolonged stay. The picture is a common one in all the novels and diaries of the day. Thus, in 1818: "I am afraid you will hardly see Warburton at present. He has been for the best part of a week with Sir John Sebright in Hertfordshire, the second visit he has paid within the last six weeks. If there were handsome daughters one might have some conjectures, but I have not the least suspicion in this case."[2] Take, by way of example, the letters of Mrs. George Bancroft (wife of the American ambassador) in 1846-9, or those of Mrs. Edward Twistleton, another American, in the fifties.[3] From time to time, especially in the summer, they travel round the countryside, staying a few days here and a week there at the country seats of their friends. Charlotte, Lady Williams Wynn, and a host of o.

---

1 In the topographical volumes of the Victoria County History the tenure of manors is traced. In many parishes (e.g.Newton Valence, Hampshire) there are accounts of seats not associated with manorial rights.

2 Lady Seymour : The Pope of Holland House, p.196.

3 See Bibliography.

others can be consulted for lists of the guests at the country house-parties which regularly punctuate their existence.[1]

The peers and their families were but the leaders of this landowning society. Respect was due to rank conferred by the sovereign; but a baronet or simple gentleman might have more acres and an older family than many a baron, and he did not always feel inferior to the latter. The higher ranks of the peerage, however, were almost inevitably adorned by great wealth in landed property, and they were treated with great deference. Mrs.Edward Twistleton, an American of good Boston family who had married the brother of a baron, felt subdued and awed in the presence of the Duchess of Northumberland.[2] Most Dukes lived in almost regal state, and were accorded almost the deference due to royalty.

Thus far the noble and gentle families, which in the countryside enjoyed unquestioned economic, social, and, as we shall see, political supremacy. We begin to discover complications as soon as we have alighted from the mail coach in London.

The first people that we encounter in our survey of London are, in a sense, a hoax. They are not Londoners or townsmen at all, but merely our old friends from the country. Some are countrymen who spend a short time in London to enjoy the gaieties of the season, and return to their homes periodically. Others are fixed in London. They are younger sons in politics or the civil service, sinecurists who have taken houses somewhere in the West End, clergy who will

---

1 See Bibliography.

2 Letters of the Hon. Mrs. Edward Twistleton, p.12.

not trouble to visit their parishes for many months to come. All these are but offshoots of the rural upper class. Even those who have no landed property themselves will commonly be found spending Christmas with their relations at the old family seat, and doing a round of other country visits in the summer. Let us then examine this group before we turn away from the class of nobility and gentry.

London was led by what was called Society with a capital S. Lady Dorothy Nevill, writing in 1906 about Society as she had known it in the 'forties and 'fifties, described something which she thought had since passed away. "In old days Society was an assemblage of people who, either by birth, intellect, or aptitude, were ladies and gentlemen in the true sense of the word .... Many years ago, when I first knew London Society, it was more like a large family than anything else. Everyone knew exactly who everybody else was, and it was extremely difficult - nay, almost impossible - for a stranger to obtain a place until credentials had been carefully examined and discussed" [1]

The titled aristocracy were at the head of London Society as they were at the head of country society. Many wealthy peers had palatial houses in London where they lived during the season and whenever they felt inclined to do so. Holland House, in Kensington; Lansdowne House, in Berkeley Square; Devonshire House, in Piccadilly; Grosvenor House, in Upper Grosvenor Street were each a lordly pied-à-terre where the territorial magnate lived in great state while in town, and entertained on a lavish scale. The squares and streets of Mayfair and Belgravia were lined with the houses kept by peers and the wealthier landed gentry. As for the slightly less wealthy

[1] The Reminiscences of Lady Dorothy Nevill pp. 100, 103 - 4.

gentleman, "if he had not a house in town, he hired one for three months or so, when he would bring up his wife and daughters for the season. Entertainments were certainly given ..... and the season over, the family would once more return to the country, there to remain until the following year." [1]

The habit of visiting London for the season had created a focus for the life of the upper classes from all parts of the countryside. It is natural to suppose that the custom helped to promote a more uniform standard of speech and habits among all the members of the class, to knit them more closely together into a "class-conscious" body. But we are not concerned to prove that point, because the process was well advanced before our period began. Shortly after the middle of the eighteenth century the World was complaining of the "too general desertion of the country". People were beginning to throng to London less, it was suggested, for the sake of business, the theatres or music, than for the pleasures of the card-table. But the migration occurred in winter, which was then the time of the parliamentary session, and there were many rough squires who would forego the pleasures of the card-table sooner than those of the hunting-field. [2] Still, Smollett in 1764 could refer to the ambition of every squire to possess a town-house. [3]

The important point in all this is that the class round which revolved the high social life of London was nothing but

---

1 Ibid, p.101.

2 Hutton: A Hundred Years Ago, pp. 332 - 3

3 Quoted in ibid, p.347

the class of rural landowners, and not that of the native Londoners who were the truly urban population. Whether these formed a part of that high London Society is another question. Observe for the present that they were not its nucleus and that they did not set its pace. If any one body of people set the pace, it was the six titled ladies who formed the committee of Almack's Assembly Rooms. They belonged to the landowning aristocracy. They issued invitations to the balls given in this "seventh heaven of the fashionable world", restricting admission "to the crême de la crême of Society, with a jealous watchfulness to prevent the intrusion of the plebeian rich or the untitled vulgar." [1] Captain Gronow, writing in 1862 his reminiscences which went back to 1814, mentions the fact that of three hundred officers of the Foot Guards, only six obtained admission to Almack's. [2] It was as exclusive as that.

London Society was not, of course, co-extensive with the rural upper class. Many a country gentleman was too poor to have a town-house or to make a regular habit of spending long periods in London. A German traveller asserts that "who nowadays would have a house in Grosvenor Square, Portland Place, Devonshire Street and several other fashionable streets, and live on an appropriate scale, must have an annual income of at least ten thousand guineas." [3] This was probably a gross exaggeration - a Frenchman in the fifties

---

1 Grantley Berkeley : Recollections, quoted in Charles L.Graves : Mr. Punch's History of Modern England, Vol.I.p.209. See Timbs: Club Life of London, Vol.I pp. 86-9.

2 Timbs, op.cit., Vol. I. p.316.

3 C.A.G.Goede : Reize door Engeland. (Dutch trans.) Vol.I, pp.69-70

'fifties puts the figure at from two to three thousand pounds [1] but at least we may be sure that the pace was too hot for the ordinary humble squire. All the same, the humble squire and the man who dallied in Grosvenor Square belonged to the same class, and dined and hunted together in the country.

Besides the landowners who came up for the season, Society had to cope with their younger sons, younger brothers, nephews and cousins who had not inherited estates. The wealthiest families could often provide these with residences on some of their numerous properties which could not all be inhabited by the head of the clan. Other young men might inherit enough hard cash to enable them to purchase estates sufficient to maintain their dignity, or contrive to marry heiresses and so keep their roots in the soil. These were common cases among the wealthiest classes, [2] but could not be common among the poorer gentry. On all sides there were cadets who were not thus provided for. But they were not left to go hungry. The institution of patronage was their stand-by.

The government, which was (as will be seen) an affair of the landed class, possessed the unrestricted power of making appointments throughout the civil service, the diplomatic service and a large portion of the Church. These appointments provided very well for the families that belonged to the party in power, and the struggle to get ' ...

---

1 Francis Wey : A Frenchman Sees the English in the 'Fifties, p.162.

2 E.G.: the family of Williams Wynn, of Wynnstay, Co.Denbigh, acquired by marriage in the eighteenth century Llangedwin and other estates. At a later time the fifth baronet, Sir Watkin (1772-1840), who lived at Wynnstay, accommodated his brother Charles (1775-1850) at Llangedwin, which nevertheless remained the property of the head of the family. See Burke: Peerage, etc., s.v.Wynn.

them contributed a good deal of the motive power that worked the party system. As Mr. Punch sang in 1841:

> All the Whigs in the world
> Fell a sighing and sobbing
> When wicked Bob Peel
> Put an end to their jobbing. [1]

Thus the diarist Henry Greville, scion of a noble house, lived comfortably as Secretary of Jamaica, an island which he never visited and which made no calls upon his time. [2] The pages of Burke's Peerage and Baronetage give abundant evidence of the provision which governments made for cadets in the civil and diplomatic services [2a] and the Church.

Other Church livings were at the disposal of private owners, who were normally also landowners. Commissions in the army were bought for cash from the retiring officers, and when sold again brought in a little sum which helped to provide for old age. But army tradition provided that the officers, who were gentlemen, should take care to sell their places only to other gentlemen. [3]

The throwing open of positions in India to competition was a sore point with people like Sir James Past, who thought it vital that these should be reserved for "men from the good families." [3a]

Not all clergy were the sons of gentlemen, for not all livings were sufficiently endowed with loaves and fishes. [4]

---

1 Vol. I, p.105.
2 P.W.Wilson's edition of The Greville Diary, Vol. I, p.21.
2a See Punch, Vol. II, p.178.
3 Francis Wey, op. cit., p. 55.
3a Letters of the Hon. Mrs. Edward Twistleton, p. 91
4 C.A.G. Goode, op.cit., Vol. II, pp 11-15.

But the fatter livings were usually reserved by their owners for friends and relations who had a position to keep up. These were the clergy who prayed "have mercy upon us, vile and miserable sinners", in a tone of voice which made it sound like "Thou seest, O Lord, what well-dressed and well-connected people we are." [1]

This upper class, landowners and their relations who had been comfortably provided for, lived a life which had some uniform features throughout the class, although varying naturally with the degree of wealth. The features which were common to all in London Society represented a higher standard of living than would be found universally among country gentlemen. But all were "carriage folk", and keeping a carriage was expensive in London. [2] All had male servants - this was an indispensable mark of gentility - and even among the lesser gentry the domestic staff would not number fewer than nine or ten of both sexes. [3] The social ideas and manners of the class could hardly be exhaustively defined, but etiquette was minutely regulated, even, (according to a French observer) down to the manner of knocking at a door: "a man of fashion and assured position gives five resounding bangs, ladies seven lighter taps in quick succession." [4] Only Society people paraded in Hyde Park, except on Sunday evenings [5]; they [illegible]

1 Letters of the Hon. Mrs. Edward Twistleton, pp. 41 - 2

2 Punch's little slum girl looked down on another whose doll had no perambulator - "I don't want mine to 'sociate with none but carridge cumpny." (Vol. XXX, p. 118). And see Francis Wey, op.cit. p. 162.

3 Early Victorian England, Vol. I, pp. 145-6.

4 Francis Wey, op.cit., p.48.

5 Francis Wey, op.cit., pp. 164-5; Sir Walter Besant: London in the Nineteenth Century, p.12.

might also be seen on foot in Regent Street. [1] In both town and country they were accustomed to being treated with deference by their inferiors: the common people waited respectfully in the village church till the Quality had gone out. [2] Finally, the upper class was distinguished by its speech. A Frenchman says of the English language: "Flat, nasal and mispronounced by the common people, it becomes when spoken by the upper classes both refined and expressive, with a charming rhythmical lightness and lilt. It is impossible for a low-born Englishman, even risen to the rank of schoolmaster or professor, ever to attain the manner of speech of the well-bred. The most thorough education cannot impart to him that elegant ease of pronunciation and expression which can only be acquired by early intercourse with the elite. And so in spite of the outward uniformity in dress, and the absence of all marks of distinction, it is sufficient for any one to have spoken half a dozen words to be immediately appraised." [3]

At the very heart of this company of noblemen and gentlemen, London Society and rusticating squires, we find the royal family. Social relationship with royalty had a value which varied from reign to reign, Kings and Princes being no more than human, and liable to failings which might diminish some of their social lustre. In the earlier days of George III, "the Court was confined to the nobility, and a few of the gentry who were well known" [4] George IV, both -

---

1 Frances Wey, op.cit., p.72

2 Early Victorian England, Vol. I, p.101.

3 Francis Wey, op.cit. p.47; E.D. Bancroft: Letters from England 1846-9, p.53.

4 Mrs. Papendick: Court and Private Life in the Time of Queen Charlotte, Vol. I. p.230.

as Regent and as King, led a private life which somewhat impaired his position as the leader of good society. Yet he identified himself with the upper class of his subjects by calling himself the first gentleman of Europe, and the pretence that his court was the pivot of Society was kept up for the sake of the institution rather than the man. [1] Under William IV and Queen Adelaide there is a more bourgeois and also a more moral spirit. Sir Edward Sugden married his kitchen-maid, after having had several illegitimate children by her. The word went forth that she could not be received at Court, and she was therefore excluded from Dublin Castle too. The father of the Fitzclarences could not have been squeamish on the moral point; it was the reek of the kitchen that did the damage. [2] That was an extreme case, but it was difficult for any members of Society to be too good for people who were good enough to be received at Court. Throughout this period, until the death of Prince Albert in 1861, royal entertainments - balls, drawing-rooms, levées - were the highlights of the London Season. To take part in them was a necessary thing in the best society. Punch, in 1842, reckoned that being "introduced" at Court would turn a man away from the friends of his youth and give him a swollen head:

> The middle-aged imbibe the cup of fortune, power or fame,
> And grow oblivious from the draught of friendship's very name;
> The caterpillar of to-day, that crawls where knaves resort,
> A butterfly to-morrow soars - because he's been at Court. [3]

---

1 For a typical aristocratic attitude to George IV, see The First Lady Wharncliffe, letters for the Regency and George IV period.

2 Greville's Diary, March 20, 1835.

3 Vol. III, p. 33.

The king, moreover, was the fountain of honour: all, from dukedom to knighthood, were at his disposal, and such marks of distinction were by themselves capable of enhancing any man's social prestige. James II was apocryphally reported to have said "Madam, I can make your son a duke, but not even God could make him a gentleman"; with such gentility as a coat-of-arms conferred the heralds would concern themselves, without trespassing upon the king's time. But the rank of esquire, higher than that of gentleman, inhered in certain offices connected with the king's service (such as that of justice of the peace, and of commissions in the army). Although the king had not in practice the disposal of such offices, the social status of esquire was yet seen to be a reflected glory deriving its light from the royal sun.

We have been enjoying the company of a patrician class - "the titled and untitled aristocracy" - every member of which is either a landowner or else the near relation of one and a frequenter of the society of landowners. We have seen them at home in their rural environment, and in their town-houses in the West End of London, parading in the park, knocking at their hosts' doors and enjoying the season in town. If we now leave the squares called after the Grosvenor family - Grosvenor, Belgrave, Eaton - and wend our way to Bloomsbury, the domain of the Duke of Bedford (such square and street names as Russell, Bedford, Woburn or Tavistock will indicate that we are there) we shall have entered an entirely different world. We may go further, and pass through Temple Bar

into the City, or turn to the suburbs further north; we shall be in the world of the middle class.

The middle class was not homogeneous. Instead of one occupation, landowning, it pursued a countless variety of tasks. Some brought in great wealth, others were ill-paid. The wealthy bourgeois might count himself greatly superior to the poor one, and one profession might look down upon another. But for all that there was a link between the great bourgeois and the petty bourgeois which did not exist between the great bourgeois and his superiors of county family. Any enterprising member of this class might begin life as a very humble member of it and quickly rise to affluence and respectability. The whole middle-class ladder could be scaled by quick and easy steps. But at the top of that ladder a halt was called. The man of humble bourgeois origin could not easily cross from the world of middle-class wealth to that of gentility. On the other hand people belonging to the upper and the lower ranks of the middle class could be found in the same family.

Bearing this caution in mind, we can get an impression of the range of the middle class by discovering the range of occupations to be found among people who were related to one another. Take George Crabbe (1754-1832), the poet. His grandfather had been a village schoolmaster in Norfolk; his father was a collector of salt duties; his uncles were a glazier (as was his brother), the captain of a slave ship, and another sailor who was wrecked in Mexico and prospered there. Crabbe married the daughter of a "substantial yeoman" [1] The same investigation for Thomas Holloway,

---

[1] D.N.B., vol.xii, p.428.

afterwards made rich by patent medicines, brings together the following: baker, inn-keeper, farmer. [1] The whole world of tradesmen - bakers, grocers, glaziers, drapers, tailors, and the like - formed the nucleus of a large section of the middle class. They were bound by numerous matrimonial ties to the rural middle class, the yeoman freeholders and farmers. Their sons were often apprenticed in the same or similar trades, but were commonly, instead, articled to Solicitors. Solicitors, booksellers, printers, engravers (an important class in those days) and journalists might rank themselves a little higher because of their learning, but they could not be clearly distinguished from the others. The father of John Nichols (1745-1826), printer and owner of the Gentleman's Magazine, was a baker, while his brother-in-law belonged to the accountants' office at the Bank of England. [2] Similarly there was no clear break between these occupations and the still more learned or artistic ones. Physicians ranked higher than surgeons, but both belonged unequivocally to the middle class. So did architects, painters, sculptors, actuaries, archivists, people who made their living by writing, actors, nonconformist ministers, apothecaries, and (where they were not also clergymen) schoolmasters. To this rule there were exceptions of a special kind which are going to receive special consideration. They did not disprove the rule.

In most of these occupations, but especially that of the stage, there was an hereditary tendency which sometimes went so far that we can hardly discover that they have any relationship

---

1 D.N.B., vol. xxvii, p.181

2 D.N.B. vol. xli, p. 2.

with other callings. Roger Kemble (1721-1802) was an actor who married his manager's daughter; all his children acted (one of them was Mrs. Siddons), and from the eighteenth century to the twentieth the family continued on the stage, marrying into their profession and handing it on to their children. [1] A similar, though less spectacular, succession on the stage was achieved by the Keans, Fawcetts, Mathews, Bannisters and others. Other middle-class dynasties were those of Nichols (printers and publishers), Morgan (actuaries), and Lemon (archivists). These cases illustrate the inheritance of taste or talent. We do not speak of dynasties which were maintained by the inheritance of property in business.

All these - from ordinary trades to learned and quasi-learned professions - were matrimonially connected not only among themselves but also with the wealthier world of merchants and manufacturers. James Boaden (1762-1839), a journalist and dramatist, was the son of a merchant in the Russia trade. His own son John Boaden (d. 1839) became a portrait painter of mediocre talent. [2] Thomas Attwood (1765-1838), the musician, was son of a coal merchant - but his social position will require further consideration. [3] George Dawe, the portrait painter (1781-1829) was another whose status was equivocal, but we may note that while his father was a mezzotint engraver, the latter's father was a city merchant. George's

---

1 D.N.B., vols. xxx and Suppl.iii, s.v. Kemble.
2 D.N.B., vol. v, pp. 278-9.
3 D.N.B., vol. ii, p. 240.

brother and brother-in-law were both engravers.[1] Luke Hansard, the parliamentary printer (1752-1828), was the son of a Norwich manufacturer who died early in embarrassed circumstances.[2]

In such examples, which are typical, we very seldom hear of any connection with a landowning family. The only exceptions in this list would be Attwood and Dawe, to whom, with others, we shall return. It may be said as a general rule that all of them - merchants, manufacturers, petty tradesmen and clerks, actors, solicitors, journalists and the rest belonged to the same class; a class which had its grades and its internal distinctions, but within which no clear boundary line separated one rank from another.

This bare sketch of the middle class will be filled out a little by the record of its relationship to the class above it. The great industrialists were, as a distinct class, newcomers in urban society, where functions analogous to theirs had formerly belonged to men who were primarily merchants. In the eighteenth century the manufacturers, whose increasing wealth caused them to be compared with the gentry, could not stand the comparison without ridicule.[3] In origin they were commonly prosperous artisans, or yeomen who left their dwindling estates for the better chances of the industrial world, and in that generation they could not easily shake off the associations of the classes from which they came. Often merchants, who had formerly been the capitalists

---

1 D.N.B. vol. xiv, p.209.

2 D.N.B., vol xxiv, p.308, and Harriet Martineau: History of the Peace, vol. II, pp. 352-4.

3 Bowden: Industrial Society in England towards the end of the Eighteenth Century.pp. 150-1.

controlling the industry of small manufacturers, became great manufacturers themselves. When, by way of exception, a member of the landed class took to this occupation, he was considered to have "deserted his caste". [1]

We have the general testimony of contemporaries on both sides that manufacturers were held in contempt by the dominant gentry, and that the former so far accepted the judgment that many of them tried as far as possible to enter the landowning class. James Watt wrote in 1787 that "our landed gentlemen (reckon) us poor mechanics no better than the slaves who cultivate their vineyards." [2] Although "slaves" and "vineyards" may both be allowed to be figures of speech, many mechanics originated in the class to which Watt referred. Others speak of the "proud and bigoted landowners who look down with contempt on the merchant or manufacturer" [3] A memoir of these times written in 1843 records the survival of "the aristocratic prejudices and the envious contempt of neighbouring peers and country gentlemen, proud of their rank and ancient family, who even in these days occasionally disgrace themselves by looking down on the men raised by merit and industry from obscurity to eminence." [4]

Francis Place, whose father was a bailiff to the Marshalsea Court, belonged in early life to the working class, [5] and then emerged from this as the tailor of Charing Cross. His business

---

1 Op.cit., pp. 138-9, 149, 155.

2 Op.cit., p. 155.

3 Ibid.

4 Strickland: Memoir of Edmund Cartwright, pp. 84-5, quoted in Bowden, op.cit., p.155.

5 We are not here concerned with the relationship between middle and working classes.

gave him occasion to clothe many wealthy and aristocratic patrons, but it need hardly be said that "the humiliations of the position were such as a proud man could hardly endure".[1] Place became acquainted with many important people, but to mitigate the feeling of humiliation he made it a rule never to visit them in their houses.[2] Who were his natural equals and friends? "Well-to-do Whig tradesmen".[3] "Mr. Elton Hammond, whose father had been a wholesale tea-dealer in the City of London, and had at his decease left a considerable property to his two sons and two daughters. .....He was emphatically my friend."[4] Place's first wife, Elizabeth Chadd, seems to have been of humble origin;[5] his second wife was an actress; his second daughter was a governess in Edinburgh.[6]

Place could move easily in such society as this; not easily among the upper class. The attitude of the latter is made clear by Charlotte Grenville, who married Sir Watkin Williams Wynn. Her reaction to the proposed marriage[7] of Thorwaldsen, the great Danish sculptor, to a cousin of Lord Caryafort's is illuminating. "Lord Caryafort takes up entirely the protection of talent & Genius and quoting Charles the 2nd, having married Vandyke to a Scotch poor's daughter, professes that the Dane has done his cousin much

---

1 Graham Wallas : Life of Francis Place, p.35.
2 Op.cit., p.181.
3 Op.cit., p.40.
4 Op.cit., p.58 n.
5 Op.cit., p.5.
6 Op.cit., p.99.
7 which seems not to have taken place.

honour, whether he would have thought the same if it had been his daughter I take leave to doubt." [1] Lord Bradford's son Charles went to Rio de Janeiro and fell in love with Miss Chamberlain, the daughter of the British Consul. [2] "The marriage has, of course, nothing to recommend it, but the young man's anxious desire for it, & to that Lord B. has at once given way in the handsomest manner possible." [3] The lady's father was afterwards made a baronet, but even Burke could not find him any ancestors. [4] It was a mésalliance. 1823 was the date.

The medical profession was not exempt from this genteel scorn. Lady Westmorland, who was the daughter of a doctor, is called "such an unusual contribution to Society." [5] Lord Sidmouth, whose father had been in the medical profession, was universally nicknamed "the Doctor", and a sneer seems to be implied. Nevertheless, these sons and daughters of doctors did move in the fashionable world, and this will have to be accounted for hereafter. Such luck would seldom, if ever, come to the ordinary country doctor, who when he visited the great house would be refreshed in the servants' hall (but not with the servants) and whose daughter was not thought a suitable match for a squire's son. [6]

Even the most eminent and cultivated people of the middle class normally associated only with people of the same rank.

---

1 Rachel Leighton: Correspondence of Charlotte Grenville, Lady Williams Wynn, p.234.

2 Consuls, especially in South America, were primarily commercial people.

3 Op.cit. pp. 231-2.

4 Burke: Peerage, etc. (1892 ed.), p.263.

5 Rachel Leighton, op. cit. p. 215.

6 Early Victorian England, pp. 96-7, 102.

Thus, when the Edward Twistletons spent an evening in 1855 with the Carlyles, it was a literary company consisting of "Mr and Mrs. Wedgwood (sister-in-law of Mrs. Mackintosh), Mrs Gaskell, who looks a delightful woman, Miss Jewsbury, and Mr. Darwin." [1] On the other hand a party at Lady Leigh's would consist of "Lord Leigh, Mr. and Mrs. Wallbanke Childers, Lady Guernsey, two Miss Percys ..... and Lady Westminster." [2] Mrs. Bancroft dined in 1846 at Macready's (the actor), and met there Carlyle, "Babbage, the great mathematician, Foublanc, the editor of the Examiner, etc. etc." [3] There was a clear difference between these societies, though many people did move in both. Fashionable people dined about seven o'clock, but the Carlyles at six. "They (the Carlyles) live in Chelsea, in the most ordinary house and style imaginable - real poverty it is - and the most wretched neighbourhood." [4] The bulk of the middle class dined at one o'clock, or at any time between twelve and two. The more pretentious preferred to dine in the evening, but at an earlier hour than was fashionable. [5] It will be observed that between six o'clock and seven there are at least fifty-nine intermediate gradations; but between one and seven there is an impassable gulf.

---

1 Letters of the Hon. Mrs. Edward Twistleton, p.266
2 Op.cit., p.16.
3 E.D.Bancroft: Letters from England, 1846-9, pp. 34-5
4 Op.cit., p.14. Early Victorian England, Vol. I. p.98
5 Early Victorian England, p.113

Between Grosvenor Square and Bloomsbury - metaphorically speaking - there lay an obscure, no-man's-land in which there was taking place a metamorphosis fundamental for the development of modern English Society. At the two extremes no important change took place between 1815 and 1867. Our evidence for the upper and the middle class has been drawn indiscriminately from every decade in that period, and does not vary from one decade to another. It is in the intermediate region that change occurred, and it is in this change that the first key to the modern social evolution of England will be discovered.

The people of that no-man's-land may be called the transitional class. It might be expected that "upper middle class" would be the more natural term, but to that we must object on two grounds. Firstly, it was generally used in the nineteenth century to describe the wealthier members of the middle class, irrespective of any other consideration; secondly, it implies a connection with the middle class and not with the upper, whereas the people in question were in a half-and-half position between the two, belonging equally to both - or neither.

It is not possible to define the transitional class. Perhaps it ought not to be called a class at all. It was a motley company like Chaucer's pilgrims, travelling slowly along the road of social change to the accompaniment of wit, sociability and good cheer. In this company we shall meet people who belong in some degree to the upper class, and others of distinctly bourgeois origin. Yet all are jogging along together and all have relationships - varying in importance as the journey proceeds - with the classes

above and below.

At all times, since the days when the Anglo-Saxon merchant who had fared thrice over the wide sea "throve to thegn-right", there had been newcomers knocking at the door of the fashionable world. If they fell very much short of the ideal cherished in that world they were not accorded a very hearty welcome, if admitted at all. In the eighteenth century, as at other times, there were complaints of the "confusion of ranks", and the obliteration of the proper marks of distinction between classes. The middle classes, it was said - brokers, attorneys, substantial tradesmen - were acquiring wealth that enabled them to affect the luxuries and trappings of their superiors. "Every tradesman is a merchant, every merchant a gentleman, every gentleman one of the noblesse." [1] The same observer, Smollett, was shocked at the obtrusiveness of the vulgar sort at the fashionable resort of Bath. His account of the appearance of the nouveaux riches there has quite a modern ring: "Clerks and factors from the East Indies; ... planters, negro-drivers and hucksters, from our American plantations....agents, commissaries and contractors, who have fattened in two successive wars, on the blood of the nation; usurers, brokers and jobbers of every kind; men of low birth and no breeding" all displayed their wealth and sought the company of "the princes and nobles of the land" [2] The latter were however by no means impressed by these people "suddenly translated into

---

1 Hutton, op.cit., pp. 347-8.

2 Quoted in op. cit., pp. 356-7

a state of affluence,", or "enriched they know not how", or "loaded with the spoil of plundered provinces". Society was in no hurry to open its doors to them.

Its doing so was the less likely because trade was no longer, as it had once been, a regular avenue of employment for armigerous younger sons. It has been suggested that the grandfather of the historian Gibbon was the last of this class to be sent to the City.[1] The rise in the value of land, which made all biggish landowners rich, drew the gentry closer to the aristocracy, while widening the gulf between gentry and middle class. In London, where the West End contained the town-houses of nobility and gentry, the merchants, unless very rich, remained in the City. Merchants, physicians and even barristers were excluded from the noble and gentle world.[2]

The choice of careers for younger sons was one factor in determining the point at which contact would be made with the middle class. Trade was, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, more or less excluded. The civil, diplomatic and colonial services, and the commissioned ranks of the army, were upper class preserves. What else could a young gentleman do?

The profession of the law, in its higher branch,[3] was one of the most ancient and honourable in England. Many young fops studied it for no other purpose than to while away their youth,

---

1 Besant; London in the Eighteenth Century, pp. 231-2

2 Op.cit., p.405

3 Barristers as opposed to solicitors.

and put their learning to no use.[1] Anyway, the woolsack was the dream of every youth at the inns of court, and it was no disgrace to a gentleman to preside over the house of lords and take precedence of the Archbishop of York and the Dukes. The bar was, at the same time, a democratic profession. The humblest origin was no obstacle to success in it, and success was held to obliterate the memory of humble birth. William and John Scott were sons of a Newcastle hoastman, or coal fitter. They studied the law and rose in its profession towards the end of the eighteenth century, till one became Lord Stowell and the other the Earl of Eldon, one a judge (1798-1828) and the other Lord Chancellor (1801 - 6, 1807 - 27). Eldon was the stiffest and most unbending of Tories, and was as dear a chrony of the other Tory peers as if he had belonged to the most ancient family.[2] These careers, though outstanding, could be paralleled by many others attached to the most illustrious names in the legal profession. Still more would be found in the humbler ranks. Joseph Hone was a brother of William Hone, the bookseller. Their father was a solicitor's clerk. Joseph became a barrister, a member of Gray's Inn; some time between 1817 and 1826 he went to Tasmania and rose to high office there.[3]

At the inns of court clerk's son and tradesman's son hobnobbed, ate and drank with gentleman's son. Brains could assure a good income. Family influence might procure political office, but it could not bring professional prestige. The career was open to talent.

The Church was another mixed profession. We have heard

---

1 C.A.G.Goede, op.cit., Vol.I, p.307.

2 D.N.B. Vol. 11, pp. 49, 108, and of course in any history of the period.

3 Francis Hackwood: William Hone, pp. 174-5, 256.

the litany being intoned by well-bred voices. But ordination could not depend upon pedigree. There were many clergy like the unfortunate man whose father was steward at Wynnstay, and got into a little trouble in 1814. [1] One would expect the clerical cloth to have a levelling effect upon all, high and low, who assumed it, but this did not happen in the Church of England. If a clergyman married into the upper class, his social origin was carefully considered. Lady Williams Wynn expressed condescending sympathy when a daughter of Lord Sydney's married "a Revd. Mr. Dawson, not related to any of the respectables of that name, and distinguished only by having lately got the living of Chislehurst in Kent." [2] But she was a Grenville, and hard to please; and the parishioners of Chislehurst, high and low, must necessarily accord a certain amount of respect to their spiritual pastor. People were always more finicky about pedigrees when marriage was involved than they were for ordinary purposes of social intercourse.

Some of the sprigs of county families had brains but not of the types suitable for the bar or the pulpit. General Conway had a daughter who became the Hon. Mrs. Damer (1749-1828). Mrs. Damer devoted herself to sculpture in which she obtained a considerable reputation.[3] Thomas Morton, the dramatist (1764?-1838), was the son of a gentleman in Durham. Byron was a peer - the sixth of his title - and Shelley the son of a baronet. But these were not even younger sons, and their careers were exceptional. University and often ecclesiastical appointments gave opportunities for patrician

---

1 Rachel Leighton, op.cit., p.172.

2 Op.cit., p.344, and see Thackeray: The Book of Snobs, pp.314-5

3 D.N.B., vol. xiii, p.450.

scholars to devote themselves to learning. Thus many sons of peers became Wardens of All Souls' - the Hon. John Tracy in 1766, the Hon. Edward Legge in 1817; and a baronet (the third of his line), Sir William Anson, in 1881. Many others graced the senior common rooms of various colleges, and associated there with the middle class and plebeian scholars whose talents had admitted them to the republic of letters. Again, a private tutor might be referred to as "the family hack"; he might, on the other hand, be a young aristocrat sent abroad with a young charge to get him out of bad company.[1]

Scholarly gentlemen and noblemen were necessarily brought by these pursuits into contact with others of humbler origin who were following the same way of life. When Keats died in 1821, Shelley called upon the world to "weep for Adonais," without considering that Adonais was the son of a livery stableman, whereas his chief mourner was heir to a baronetcy. "Talent & Genius", which did not impress Lady Williams Wynn, could not be so contemptuously dismissed by people qualified to appreciate them. At all times literary, artistic and scientific genius had obtained entry into the best Society, because such commodities were valued there. Thus Lady Dorothy Nevill: "The old leisured aristocracy of the past delighted in gathering together people of conversational power, and for this reason alone certain individuals whose sole credentials were their wit and mental cultivation were accorded a place in Society. There were

---

1 Rachel Leighton, op.cit., pp. 37, 362.

several such men, of whose origin nothing was known or asked, whose claim to social consideration lay in cultivated and well-stored brains - these were welcomed without demur." [1]

This is borne out by all the accounts of upper class society early in the century. At aristocratic parties would be found such people as "Conversation" Sharp (1759-1835), of middle class origin; Samuel Rogers the poet (1763-1855), son of a banker; the artist Sir Thomas Lawrence (1769-1830), son of an innkeeper; John Murray, the publisher; and, in fact, most of the greater literary and artistic celebrities. [2] This feature of society became more marked as the century advanced, and, what was more important, the prestige attaching to mere wit and conversational powers began to colour the learned occupations themselves. In 1825 a daughter of the Earl of Minto could be a little apologetic about the medical professio After all, "Mama's Grandfather made an immense fortune as a physician". [3] But even at that time a very great doctor like Sir Henry Halford would be invited to go "en ami (not professionally) "to Windsor. [4] Sir Anthony Carlisle (1768-1840) and Sir Astley P. Cooper (1768-1841), who made £21,000 in one year, could both be met in Society. It may have been that the lustre of these few lit up their fellows,

---

1 Reminiscences of Lady Dorothy Nevill, p.106.

2 See all these in D.N.B. - and, for some of their social appearances, Reminiscences of Lady Dorothy Nevill, p.47; Lady Seymour: The Pope of Holland House, p.262: Journal of of Hon. H.E.Fox (1818-30), pp. 33, 48, 115, 120; for Rogers, see numerous references in index.

3 Rachel Leighton, op.cit., p. 327

4 Op.cit., p.300.

or that the advance in medical science made them more respectable. However that may be, it began to be the custom to refer to "the learned professions" as a group, and to class them, in an equivocal and hesitating way, with the upper classes. Sir Walter Besant asserts that, about 1837, the London Clubs "are intended exclusively for noblemen, gentlemen, the services, and the professional classes. No person engaged in trade, not even a great merchant, could hope for admission".[1] In the 'fifties it is said that "every man living on his income or exercising one of the learned professions has his abode in the West End: if not he loses caste."[2] On the other hand Mrs. George Bancroft, in 1848, defines the upper middle class as "the professional and mercantile class." Mr. Ralph Nevill, writing of a period which must have been not earlier than the 'sixties, places all the great doctors - Sir Richard Quain, Sir Oscar Clayton, Sir Henry Thompson, Sir William Jenner, Sir James Paget - among the lions of Society.[3]

One cannot say anything more precise, on this question, than that the professional class figured a good deal more prominently at fashionable parties at the end of our period than at the beginning; and, what is more important, that the professions as such had acquired a status which they did not possess in 1815. Among the prominent figures in Society in the 'forties and 'fifties were Sir William Hooker, Keeper of Kew Gardens; George Grote, historian and

---

1 Besant: London in the Nineteenth Century, p.20.

2 Francis Wey, op.cit., p. 70.

3 Ralph Nevill: The World of Fashion, 1837-1922, p.242

banker; the Merivales - Herman, economist and permanent under-Secretary, and Charles, historian and dean (they were of bourgeois origin); Nassau Senior, the economist; Mr. (afterwards Sir George) Cornewall Lewis, editor of the Edinburgh Review; A.H.Layard, archeologist; J.T. Delane, editor of the Times. [1]

It is instructive to compare this list with one of the wits in Society thirty years earlier. What is significant is not the middle class origin of these great men of the 'fifties (some were of gentle birth), but the fact that so many of them were in paid employment. In the earlier period conversational powers had procured men a welcome at dinner-parties. Now it was the learned professions themselves that were accorded respect; professors, doctors, scientists and editors were coming to be acceptable in virtue of their professional status. There was George Cornewall Lewis, for instance, of ancient family and heir to a baronetcy, becoming an editor. In the days of Jeffrey, Gifford and Theodore Hook editorship was scarcely respectable, and certainly no trade for a gentleman. In the 'fifties Francis Wey could say that a journalist was "less than a dog unless he belongs to the staff of the Times." [2] He may have been thinking only of the daily press; Sir G.C.Lewis could not be so described. Anyway, it is clear that the social status of journalism had improved with that of the other professions.

---

1 See all of them in D.N.B.; also Letters of the Hon.Mrs.Edward Twistleton, pp 14,96, 112, 209, 254; E.D.Bancroft: Letters from England, 1846-9, pp.50-1

2 Francis Wey, op.cit., p.57.

Clubs, it has been said, admitted the learned professions in 1837 but set themselves resolutely against the odour of the Counting house. Bankers, merchants and manufacturers as such could not be presumed to be ornaments of the dinner-table as could men of wit and learning. They had, however, what men of learning too seldom had - wealth, and this could not be altogether overlooked. Here we encounte a cross-current of social prejudice. In ordinary social intercourse the upper class would attach most importance to the code of habits and manners and ideas, and perhaps to talent of some kind, in regulating admission to its ranks. But these were quite insufficient to qualify anyone for marriage. So important was money in this connection that Lady Williams Wynn, for instance, was not satisfied to mention the betrothal of any young lady without stating the income of the happy man. Thus "the marriage of Catherine Fortescue to Mr. R.D.Fellowes... with a clear estate of £9,000 pr.ann.;" or of "Lady Catherine Eliot with a Mr. Boileau, a perfection with £4000 pr.an." [1] These were in 1820 and 1825 respectively. Punch, in its early years, poked fun at this attitude. "A wife to be justly called the better part of a man must bring with her a sufficient quantity of the precious metal .... Happily, my son, this truth is now so generally acknowledged in good society that, unless you were wilfully callous to its influence, you could not fail to be affected by it ...

..... If, after long courtship, you find the lady has not the money you at first imagined, hesitate not a moment, but drop her. It may seem cruel, but depend upon it, 'tis all for her good." [2] This

---

1 Rachel Leighton, opcit., pp. 246, 327.

2 Vol.III, p.250. And see p. 111.

was in 1842. Thackeray, in 1846, made merry over the same custom. "The astonishment is, how Emily Harley Baker could have stooped to marry Raymond Gray; ..... she, who had but £4000 pour tout potage, to marry a man who had scarcely as much more. A scream of wrath and indignation was uttered by the whole family when they heard of this mésalliance." [1]

With the precious metal in such demand, and with too many gentle families short of it, wealthy parvenus had perforce to be accepted with a good grace. Some kinds of business were less repugnant to the genteel world than others. Banking, for instance. The Baring family had found it a golden road to the peerage. Sir Francis Baring (1740-1810) founded the bank; he became Chairman of the East India Company, a baronet and member of Parliament. His eldest son was father of the first Lord Northbrook; his second son became Lord Ashburton. [2] Samuel Jones Loyd, of the London and Westminster Bank, was raised to the peerage as Lord Overstone in 1860 - he was a figure in Society too. [3] Thomas Coutts (1735-1822), who founded Coutts and Co., was the means of enriching several landed families. His third daughter Sophia married Sir Francis Burdett; their daughter ultimately inherited the Coutts wealth and became the Baroness Burdett-Coutts. The banker married, as his second wife, Harriet Mellon, a "third-rate actress", who had been his mistress.

---

1 Book of Snobs, p.434.

2 D.N.B., vol.iii, pp. 190-3; and Burke: Peerage etc. s.v.Northbrook Ashburton.

3 D.N.B. vol.xxxiv, p.224; Letters of the Hon.Mrs.Edward Twistleton, pp. 95, 101.

After his death she married the Duke of St. Alban's, but she was always generous to her first husband's children, and left her wealth to Miss Burdett-Coutts.[1]

Even from banking families a little more than wealth was required. Of Lord Overstone it was said that his "only daughter, Miss Jones Loyd, will be another Miss Burdett Coutts, as far as fortune goes - but more fortunate in other respects, as Lady Overstone is a thorough lady, and as endless pains, and very judicious care, have been taken with her education." [2]

The fifth Earl of Elgin had married the daughter of a London banker, [3] and many more examples could be given. We shall only add that banking seems to have come to be regarded as a suitable pursuit for members of the upper class: the Hon. Douglas Kinnaird (1788-1830) was a banker.

If commerce and industry took longer than finance to be socially recognised, it may have been because the men who belonged to them were too deeply immersed in business to acquire the mental habits of a leisured class. Manufacturers, as has been seen, were in the early nineteenth century normally people of humble origin. To make money it was necessary to devote all their attention to business, and this kept them unfit for more cultivated society. A Yorkshire clergyman spending a holiday at Buxton in 1822 encountered there a party of manufacturers, "all rich, very rich, that is to say possessing each between two and three hundred thousand pounds of their .

---

1 D.N.B., vols.xii, p.354, xxxvii, p.223; 2nd Suppl., i,p.259; Harriet Martineau: History of the Peace, vol iv,pp.68-9 Rachel Leighton, op.cit., p.340

2 Letters of the Hon.Mrs.Edward Twistleton, p.101.

3 Rachel Leighton, op.cit., p.109 n; Burke: Peerage, etc.,s.v.Elgin.

own acquisition, and very well-informed men and well principled as to Politics, and with plenty of conversation; but totally without the manner either of thinking or behaviour which gives the real charm to Society." Their critic goes on to explain that they could talk of nothing but the manufacture of muslins and calicoes.[1]

Some of the most eminent manufacturers had made their way into Society in the time-honoured way of acquiring land. Sir Richard Arkwright rose to attain a knighthood and the shrievalty of Derbyshire, and "we must not forget to inform our readers that Sir Richard during the whole Assize provided a plentiful table, with the choicest wines etc., for such gentlemen as pleased to partake of the noble banquet." [2] By 1816 there was a general improvement. Sydney Smith visited a manufacturing family and wrote the comment: "It is not among gentlemen of that description I would at present look for all that is delightful in manner and conversation, but they certainly run 'finer' than they did, and are (to use their own phrase) a superior article." [3] Still later, when industrial fortunes had more generally descended to the second and third generations, they were becoming highly respectable. A German traveller early in the century/

---

1 The First Lady Wharncliffe, Vol.I, pp. 308-9

2 Manchester Mercury, March 27, 1787, quoted in Hutton, op.cit.p.153

3 Lady Seymour: The Pope of Holland House, p.312

century could remark "that for a brewer to take part in the debates in Parliament, to possess one of the most important houses in London, and to invite to it artists, scholars, and the most cultivated company - that would be regarded as an exceptional phenomenon in any other country, but in England is nothing unusual" [1] But the period 1835 - 70 is said to have been the great day of brewing fortunes. "This was clearly demonstrated in an enquiry into the legality of the will of a predecessor of the late Sir Henry Meux. In 1841 Sir Henry Meux's share in the great monopoly was worth £200,000 - in 1858 it was worth £600,000; and this in spite of a career of fifteen years' neglect of business, of hunting and racing, of French cooks, collecting china, and every kind of extravagance; of battues, moors, and deer-forests, of Epsom, Newmarket, and Ascot, and an entire lack of attention to the brewing business, for which Sir Henry Meux had no taste." [2]

Commerce was older and more respectable than industry, but the aforesaid German observer noted that many of the City merchants lived in old-fashioned simplicity, avoiding the society of the upper classes, whose ways were too "polished" for men of simple habits to follow. [3] Nevertheless, "the consciousness, which is common to all classes in this country, that personal and deserving qualities raise a man above all that may be considered degrading in his bourgeois business, sustains that general striving after a culture which puts people upon a footing of equality with the higher classes in society." [4]

---

1 C.A.G. Goede, op.cit., Vol.II, p.106.
2 Ralph Nevill, op.cit., p.194.
3 C.A.G. Goede, op.cit., Vol.II, pp. 138-9.
4 Op.cit. Vol. II, p.106.

This striving has been seen not to have gone far enough in 1837 to open the London Clubs to commerce. But in 1856 a French visitor went to the Reform Club to call on a business man to whom he had an introduction. [1] Even in the 'forties such people were evidently a normal feature of Society. Among the highest figures in the commercial world were the directors of the East India Company, and they had long figured in good Society. Thackeray's Mr.Goldmore, the 1846 version of an East India director, belonged to the best clubs - as did Mulligatawney, another director - was regarded by the other members as an ornament to the institution, drove in the park and lived in Portland Place. [2] Another East India director of Thackeray's was Chuttney, also classed as a snob; and Aldermen - who were business men - were classed with Lords and Generals as people who were asked to dinner. [3] A real live East India director in the 'fifties was Mr. Prinsep, whose wife was a popular hostess at Little Holland House. [4]

The change in the character of Society is summarised briefly round the dinner-tables of the great. At aristocratic parties of the 'fifties might be met not only artists, poets and novelists, not only East India directors and ennobled bankers, but editors, doctors, merchants and manufacturers. Such were Delane, Elwin, Prinsep, Forster Cobden; and many great men like Gladstone and Cardwell were sons of merchants.

It was chiefly in the 'forties that this change took place. We have seen a change in the clubs between 1837 and 1856. Punch [5]

---

1 Francis Wey, op.cit., p.42.
2 Book of Snobs, pp. 134 - 5
3 Op.Cit., p.368.
4 Letters of the Hon. Mrs. Edward Twistleton, pp. 96, 122.
5 Op.cit. pp. 109-111, 122, 268-9; and D.N.B., s.v.

in the 'forties made a habit of ridiculing the practice among the middle classes of imitating the ways of their superiors. The archtypes of social climbing are Mr. and Mrs. Spangle Lacquer, in whom Thackeray describes the successful business man and his wife doing everything that is done in the best Society. [1] Thackeray's articles in 1846-7, afterwards issued as the Book of Snobs, [2] broke what appears to have been at that time new ground, drawing attention to the absurdity of being unnatural and of pretending to a social status higher than one really possessed. The Court Circular was parodied; the entertainments and amusements of the middle class solemnly described.[3] In the 'fifties this joke is seldom heard, and we must conclude that social climbing had become too common to attract comment, since we know that it had not become less so. The citadel was very nearly taken.

Mr. Ralph Nevill was no doubt writing of this time (his mother's youth) when he described the great gap between upper and middle classes, "only rarely bridged by the marriage into the aristocracy of some wealthy merchant's daughter"; but "when later on younger sons of good family began to go into the City and into trade, the upper middle class began gradually to merge itself into the aristocracy, a number of whom, bereft of the privileges and advantages which had formerly fallen to their share, were only too glad to welcome anyone likely to enable them to continue living on the scale to which they had always been accustomed." [4]

---

1 Punch., Vol. IV, pp. 23, 99-100.
2 See Bibliography.
3 See Punch, Vol. II, pp. 152, 162; Vol.III, p.111; Vol.IV, pp. 23, 99-100.
4 Ralph Nevill, op.cit., p.21

Mr. Nevill and his mother (Reminiscences, p.104) would put this change later than the 'forties; other evidence shows that it was well advanced by then. The Quarterly Review in 1840 regarded the decline of Almack's as "a clear proof that the palmy days of exclusiveness are gone by in England; and though it is obviously impossible to prevent any given number of persons from congregating and re-establishing an oligarchy, we are quite sure that the attempt would be ineffectual, and that the sense of their importance would scarcely extend beyond the set." [1]

What concerned the old upper class most acutely was the question of the manners and social code of the newcomers. Eliza Farren, the actress, married the twelfth Earl of Derby in 1797. She was welcomed and "considered the most accomplished lady in the peerage". [2] "In distinction of manner and refinement of bearing she appears to have had no rival except Mrs. Abington." [3] George Grote, the historian, was very welcome in Society - he was "the most high-bred and superior of men". [4] On the other hand George Hudson, the vulgar railway king, and his wife with her "dress me for ten" and "dress me for twenty" were given no admittance, in spite of their wealth and their parties for which someone else issued the invitations. [5] Forster and Cobden were received, but their manners were severely commented upon, and Lord Leigh objected to all the "Manchester School" - "he couldn't endure them, they weren't gentlemen." [6]

Earlier in the century the unfortunate outsiders had little opportunity of copying the model, since they seldom saw it at

---

1 Timbs, Club Life of London, Vol. I, pp 86-9 and cf. Quarterly Review vol. lvii (1836), p.80.
2 Harriet Martineau, op.cit., Vol. II, p.361.
3 D.N.B., vol. xviii, p. 230.
4 Letters of the Hon. Mrs. Edward Twistleton, p.302.
5 E.D.Bancroft, op.cit., pp.113-4,193; Reminiscences of Lady Dorothy Nevill p.104.
6 Letters of the Hon. Mrs. Edward Twistleton pp.109.12.

close quarters. That is why the social change is so largely attributed to the railways and the illustrated papers. In the trains the only class distinction, after the very first years when there may have been a tendency to keep to one's place, [1] was that of wealth. The nouveau riche sat opposite the gentleman. The illustrated papers depicted the material side of upper class life.

This, then, is the change in the transitional class. The professional and big business men had acquired wealth, they had acquired knowledge and the social graces. The gap between them and the upper classes narrowed; that which separated them from the middle classes widened - just as, in the eighteenth century, the gentry moved nearer to the aristocracy and away from the middle class. The time of greatest change would be judged by one observer to be the 'forties, by another the 'sixties. In any case we could, in 1867, class the professional men, the bankers, big merchants and industrialists with the nobls and gentle classes in the upper ranks of Society. In 1815 they could make no such pretence.

---

1. Sir Walter Besant: London in the Nineteenth Century, p.12.

CHAPTER II.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE GOVERNING CLASS.

Was there any connection between social status and political power? In other words, was the upper class also a governing class?

If this question were asked of present day conditions, it would involve a number of separate enquiries into various mutually independent abodes of authority, such as Parliament, local government, the Civil Service and the Army. But in our period these were not mutually independent. The government, then as now, depended for its existence on the support of the House of Commons, and its members were also members of Parliament. But the government in the first two thirds of the nineteenth century exercised an almost all-embracing control over the various parts of the political and administrative system.

The extent of this control is soon demonstrated. There was never, in our period, a system of recruitment to the home civil service by competitive examination. An Order-in-Council of 1855 began the introduction of qualifying examinations for recruits to some departments, but appointments were not dependent on the order of merit in which the candidates were placed. The appointments were government favours, bestowed by way of patronage on valuable supporters of the government party, or their dependents. We have seen that this system was almost a necessary consequence of primogeniture in the inheritance of land, and that the competition for these prizes was one of the main forces underlying the rivalry of parties.

The civil service was not, therefore, an independent political force to be contrasted to the legislature. Its more desirable prizes would inevitably go to the families most closely connected with the government or sitting on the government benches in Parliament. The humbler appointments, before 1832, might go to freemen or burgesses or potwallopers with important votes, but in any case these posts were not powerful enough to qualify their holders for inclusion in the governing class.

The government, chiefly through the Lord Chancellor, owned the advowson of a great many Churches, which were thus in the same class as the civil service appointments. Bishops were appointed by the Crown. Where Church livings were not in the nomination of the Crown or the Bishops they belonged almost always to private landowners, commonly the lords of the manors coincident with the parishes in question. Since the Toleration Act and the growth of Nonconformity, the Anglican pulpits had been a little blunted as weapons of propaganda, but they still had a good deal of political importance. If the government were in the hands of the middle or working class, it would share the control of the Church with the landowners; but if these controlled the government, they would enjoy the undivided control of the Church also.

The local administration and the carrying out of much important legislation were in the hands of Justices of the Peace, nominated by the government. It is true that these magistrates, who were unpaid amateurs, have been famous for their independence and their ability to stand up to governments. But they were drawn almost wholly from the landowning class, and were not disposed to

quarrel with landowning legislators or ministers when class interests were involved.

The army was in a different position. Whereas the government now controls appointments to commissioned rank, before 1871 the officers in fact appointed themselves by buying the commissions from their predecessors. This system did in theory open the army to everyone who had money enough, whatever his social origin. But in practice the career was confined to gentlemen; not to the landowning class, but to men who possessed the social graces of that class. This for two reasons: army custom bound retiring officers to sell their commissions to gentlemen; and the intimate and hearty good fellowship of an officers' mess did not admit of great social heterogeneity. Social prejudice was nowhere stronger than there, and a "cad" would be cold-shouldered out. The army, therefore, was an upper class affair. Its composition was not effectively under government control, but government and army would present an harmonious unity as long as Parliament, and its creature the cabinet, were in patrician hands.

Parliament was therefore the pivot of the governing class. If the upper class controlled Parliament it would control the government and consequently the whole public life of the country. There remains the possibility that Parliament itself might be divided, that the two Houses might represent different social classes The House of Lords was the very embodiment of the upper class. The answer to our original question will therefore be found by examining the composition of the House of Commons. If this, too, was blue-blooded and armigerous, then the upper class can be said

to have had complete control of the political machinery of England. The object of the present chapter is to establish this point, and to investigate any changes in the degree of this control during our period.

The members of the House of Commons were not quite independent agents, and we cannot understand the significance of their social status without a glance at the men who elected them. The electorate might have exercised its control by deputy, by filling the legislature with obedient men of straw, as has happened in some countries. To some extent this did happen in England. Before 1832 many peers and other other great landowners controlled or influenced the elections in boroughs. According to Oldfield, 330 of the 405 English borough seats were subject to either nomination or influence,[1] and this power belonged to the landowners. They often nominated for these seats men of humble origin and without means or ambition, as these would be more completely dependent on their patrons than would bright but youthful scions of the great families. We shall see, however, that this element was not important enough to make much difference to the lustre of the best club in Europe.

The landowners continued to be very powerful in the electorate after 1832, for although the rottenest boroughs had gone, the loss was somewhat compensated by the Chandos clause in the act. This gave the vote in counties to £50 tenants-at-will, who, with the £10 copyholders, were a solid support for their landlords, since there was no secret ballot.

---

[1] Quoted in Halévy, History of the English People in 1815, p.127

But whatever the nature of the electorate the House was at all times jealous of its independence, and refused to regard itself as an assembly of delegates. The members were in theory, and before 1867 very largely in practice, representatives.

We turn, therefore, to the social composition of the House itself.

Dr J.A.Thomas, in his valuable study of the functional character of the House of Commons[1], has given a statistical analysis of the economic interests represented there. Where a member has represented more than one interest (by being, for instance, both a landowner and a railway director) Dr Thomas has counted him twice or more, so that the total number of interests counted is much greater than the number of members. Bearing this in mind, we may look at the general picture thus obtained before going on to our own examination. Between 1832 and 1865 the number of landowning interests represented (and this in fact must mean individual landowners) fell slightly, from 489 to 436.[2] In the same period, however, the representation of financial, commercial and industrial interests rose from 248 to 545. This means not only an increase in the number of middle class business men in the House, but also an increase in the number of landowners who were at the same time engaged in business, since the overlap is much bigger at the later date. This we take to be a very important fact, but we postpone the interpretation of it while we proceed to our own analysis.

---

[1] The House of Commons, 1832 - 1901.

[2] For all these statistics, ibid., pp. 4 - 12.

The analysis that follows is confined to the members for England and Wales, and is based not on economic interest but on social origins. In the last chapter we arrived at a convenient social classification, but difficulties arise as soon as we apply this yardstick to particular people. We can be sure, for instance, that sons of landowners would belong to upper class society; but did grandsons of landowners necessarily move in it? This would depend partly on the size of the family estate and partly on the extent to which the relations kept in touch with the head. Thus the younger son of a great landowner would enjoy a high social position, possibly a sinecure appointment in the civil service, possibly even the use of one of the family estates. His sons would grow up in close contact with the social circle to which their grandfather belonged. But the younger son of a poor landowner would have to push his fortunes in the company of middle class professional and business men, and his sons would be likely to move normally in that sort of environment.

On the other hand a family without male descendants, expecting its estate to pass to a distant cousin, a relation by marriage or even an adopted heir, would keep closely in touch with that heir, so that he would be regarded as a member of the landowning class, whatever the milieu in which he had been born.

What could be said of a landowning family whose land was in the West Indies? What of landowners who were Nonconformists or Jews? Of the illegitimate son of a landowner? We have seen too that the position of commercial and professional people would vary with the scale of their operations, and this is often difficult to

discover in the case of obscure men living a century ago.

What we have called the transitional class was a mixture drawn from the ranks of the landowners as well as of the middle class. Its members have a common label because they associate together; but some of them associate also with the landowning class, from which they were drawn, and when we must find labels for individuals we cannot deny that the landowning class includes these men.

It is therefore necessary to be somewhat arbitrary in this classification. It will be based on the two principles of occupation and birth; in no case will a man be classified by his own occupation - the occupation of his father will be the chief guide, but in some cases those of the grandfathers will be taken into account. Allowance will be made for colonial origin and for religion. Our classes will be as follows:

(1) Landowning. Everyone whose father was a landowner, or whose mother was the daughter of a landowner - except in a few cases where the marriage was notoriously a mesalliance. Where this cannot be presumed, the mother's status is taken as evidence that the father was accepted in the landowning class. Also everyone whose father was the son of a peer, or the heir of a landowner who died vita patria. Lastly, men who while not sons of landowners were heirs to landed estates and appear to have been in close touch with the relations whom they succeeded. Illegitimate sons will be included, since their fathers usually took particular care to get them on in the world. But we exclude families whose land

was in the colonies, or who were Nonconformists or Jews - with the single exception of the powerful and wealthy family of Rothschild.

(11) Transitional. Here we shall include only those "transitional" people who were not sprigs of landowning families. The class therefore comprises the sons of professional men, except of surgeons; the sons of wholesale export or import merchants and of all London merchants; of bankers; of the more eminent civil servants, including Colonial Governors; of Anglican clergymen; and of Colonial, Jewish and Nonconformist landowners. But the class does not include people of these descriptions who are also qualified to be in the preceding class. Thus a man whose father was a banker but whose mother was the daughter of a landowner would be in the landowning class; so would the son of a landowning clergyman or of a Colonial Governor who owned land in England.

(111) Other This heterogeneous body is not a single class, but includes all the remainder. One may note in it, in addition to very humble men, the sons of Colonial and Jewish merchants, of provincial retail merchants, of brewers and manufacturers, of surgeons, sea captains, and Nonconformist clergy.

Obviously this classification will be unsatisfactory in many particular cases, but it will serve to distinguish fairly accurately the unequivocal members of the upper class from the newer elements that were hovering on its borders, and these in turn from the people who had no claim to belong to that high social stratum. By this standard we can measure the social composition of the House of Commons and the changes it underwent during the period.

The method of conducting this analysis was to prepare a card index of the members (for England and Wales only) of the six parliaments analysed. The information for each card was obtained from these sources:

Dictionary of National Biography

Sir B. Burke: Peerage, Baronetage etc (1892 ed.)

Sir B. Burke: Landed Gentry (1894 and 1937 editions)

Edmund Lodge: Peerage (1843 ed)

Men of the Time (Publ. Routledge) (1868 and 1872 editions

Men and Women of the Time (1899 ed)

Who Was Who (1897 - 1916)

The Gentleman's Magazine (obituary notices)

The Annual Register (obituary notices)

All the sources used for the educational analysis (see p.115)

Individual Biographies.

Special references for particular cases, e.g. Greville's Diary

Neale's Views of Seats, The Beauties of England and Wales, The Victoria County Histories etc. (see Bibliography

This information was obtained for the first three parliaments (1818, 1820 and 1826) and the last three (1857, 1859 and 1865) in the period.

The analysis gives the following result:

able A Year	Landowning.	Transi-tional	Other	Un-known	Vacant Seats	Totals	Land Owning as % of known cases	Land owning as % of total no.
1818	377(12)	27(3)	25(4)	81	8	513	88.1	74.2
1820	378 (9)	26(3)	21(5)	87	1	513	88.9	73.6
1826	379(12)	26(2)	23(6)	82	3	513	88.6	74.3
1857	336 (3)	35(5)	34(7)	91	-	496	83.0	67.7
1859	350 (4)	32(3)	30(6)	82	2	496	85.0	70.9
1865	341 (1)	42(3)	31(8)	86	-	500	82.4	68.2

These figures suggest several preliminary problems. The numbers in rackets are not likely to affect the conclusions much. They represent ncertain cases of two kinds: (1) cases of uncertain identity, where the ember of parliament cannot be certainly identified with the man of the ame name for whom the information is available - but they are all cases here there is a strong presumption in favour of the identity; (11) cases here the information available is ambiguous, where the father e.g. might e either a wealthy merchant or a small shopkeeper. In these cases other vidence has been taken into account, such as that the man sent his son to arrow, in which case he would be counted as a wealthy merchant, but ncluded in the bracketed figure. These bracketed figures were all ncluded in the totals.

A more serious difficulty is presented by the unknown cases, who remain throughout in the neighbourhood of 15 per cent. of the whole. These are people whose social status cannot be discovered in any of the sources used. Can we draw any negative conclusion from this fact? Can it be said that they are at least not in the landowning class, since they are not in Burke's Landed Gentry? Obviously not, since the Landed Gentry has no pretensions to being complete, and many landed families of 1815 died out or lost their land before 1894, the date of the earliest edition of the Landed Gentry used (or available) for this work. But we can say that this factor would be of less importance in the last three Parliaments than in the first three, so that the proportion of the landowning class in the "unknown" column would almost certainly be lower at the later dates. We can add that the people in that column were fairly obscure and unimportant, since they have left so little trace. We can suppose that at all times more of the unknown cases would belong to the second than to the third class, since a man of humble origin who was of the House of Commons would be likely to be a man of talent, whose record would not escape us. This need not be presumed to so great an extent of the second class.

The change in the social character of the house during the period runs closely parallel to the change in its functional character as shown by Dr Thomas. There was a decline, definite and significant though not very great, in the strength of the upper class. In the earlier years it constituted the over-whelming majority of the members, even if we assume that none

of the unknown cases should be included in it. But many of them must be included. The strength of the class may therefore have been between 80 and 85 per cent. of the House. And in the later period it lay roughly between 75 and 80 per cent. - a figure that would have surprised the legislators of 1832. At the same time there was a distinct rise in the numbers we have assigned to the transitional class - an increase, from first to last, of some 50 per cent. And the third class increased by 36 per cent.

A little more light is thrown on these figures when they are considered in terms of party divisions. Parties were not, by modern standards, either organised or disciplined in our period; party affiliations are not always easy to determine; and the party system underwent profound changes between 1815 and 1867. But if we examine the division lists on certain significant bills and motions we do get an idea of the reaction of social classes to various kinds of political progress. An issue which provides an excellent shibboleth to divide progressive from reactionary politicians is the position of the established church. Proposals to diminish its endowments or encroach upon its monopoly usually divided the Parliamentary sheep and goats very clearly. And this issue is especially interesting in that it did not directly or obviously affect the property rights of landowners or capitalists.

Here we have the division lists on four occasions when parties were fairly clearly divided, two in the earlier and two

in the later period. The first was the vote on Tierney's motion for a Committee on the State of the Nation (May 18, 1819). The government made it a question of confidence, and got a large majority, but the genuine Whigs and Radicals all voted on the other side. The second was the division, on March 6, 1827, on Sir Francis Burdett's motion "for taking into consideration the laws imposing civil disabilities on His Majesty's Roman Catholic Subjects, with a view to their relief". This was in the year of Canning's ministry, when a liberal wind was blowing, but before Peel had been converted to emancipation. The motion was lost by four votes, and the division gives a good indication of where progressive opinion was to be found. The third and fourth lists are both votes in the House of Commons on the Church Rates Abolition Bill, or Bills, since this measure passed the Commons on several occasions and was rejected by the Lords. The first of these divisions is on the third reading of the Bill of 1868 (June 8), and the other on the second reading of that of 1866 (March 7).[1] The members from Scotland and Ireland have been removed from the lists, and the paired absentees added. The party label is of course that which approximately describes the lobby in question.

---

1. These lists will be found in Hansard, Vol. xl, pp.549 - 53; Vol xvi (N.S.) pp. 1009 - 13; Vol cl. (3rd series) pp.1727 -31; and Vol clxxxi (3rd series) pp.1691 - 5.

Table B.

	1819		1827		1858		1866	
	Noes (Tory)	Ayes (Whig)	Noes (Tory)	Ayes (Whig)	Ayes (Lib.)	Noes (Cons.)	Ayes (Lib.)	Noes (Cons.)
down-ing	204(3)	119(2)	175	164(1)	114(2)	125(1)	121(2)	169
neit-ional	15(5)	9	8(3)	16(1)	22(2)	5(1)	25	8(1)
er	12(1)	7	7(3)	9(1)	23(3)	3(2)	25(5)	4
nown	52	22	50	23	51	21	46	29
al	283	157	240	212	210	154	217	210

Certain points stand out very prominently here. In the earlier period the proportion of upper class members is much the same on both sides. This was before the Reform Act; before the Whigs had committed themselves to the representation of specifically middle class interests. Parties were still largely self-seeking organisations competing for the spoils of office. Consequently the transitional and other classes were divided between the parties very nearly in proportion to their strength, though with a stronger leaning to the Whig side in 1827

The later period offers a very different picture. The landowning class was concentrating on the conservative, the second and third classes on the Liberal benches.

Parties had changed their character, and while the Conservatives were drawn preponderantly from the patrician ranks, the Liberal Party was an alliance of progressive members of the upper class with the representatives of the new classes brought forward by the Industrial Revolution.

Another fact catches the eye. In the earlier years the unknown cases belonged mostly to the Tory side, but in the later period to the Liberals. This class in the first three Parliaments was divided fairly equally between two kinds of constituency: rotten, or at least dependent, boroughs and large industrial towns. As most of the control and influence in boroughs was in the hands of Tories, it may be reasonable to suppose that the many Tory nonentities were the clients of boroughmongers. This class was absent from the later Parliaments, where middle class influence was growing. It is not unlikely that many of the unknown Liberals should be added to the second and third social classes which, as has been shown, belonged mostly to that side of the House.

It should be noted in passing that Dr. Thomas has shown a preference of the landowning interest for the Tory side at the end of this period, while commercial and industrial interests were overwhelmingly preponderant among the Liberals.

If we turn from the supporters and opponents of governments to the cabinets themselves, we are forced to concede an even greater power to the landowning class, no less among Liberals

than among Conservatives. We take the administration of Liverpool, as it was in 1818, and those of 1830, 1855 and 1866 as examples. Grey's Cabinet of 1830 belonged entirely to the landowning class. In the other cabinets there were only isolated exceptions, and even these could often be claimed for the patricians We would put both Gladstone and Disraeli in the transitional class, as also Lord Cranworth (son of a clergyman, but himself, after all, a peer) and Canning, who came of a landed family but whose father was cut off for his marriage with an actress. In the third class, by origin, were two notable peers, Eldon and Chelmsford. Thus the exceptions were the two greatest statesmen of the century, and three peers. Otherwise the landowning class claims all the ministers in the cabinets of Lord Liverpool (as in 1818; Tory), Grey (1830, Whig), Palmerston (1855, approximately Liberal) and Derby (1866, Conservative)

It appears, then, that Parliament was dominated throughout the period not only by landowners, but by the sons of landowners; and that the Reform Act was followed by a steady increase in the proportion not only of business men, but of the sons of business men, and (still more significantly) of business men who were landowners and fine gentlemen as well. These are the most important facts to be interpreted.

An early nineteenth century lawyer would have called it a waste of time to enquire how many members of the House of Commons were landowners, since the law required that they should all be

landowners. All members of the House for England and Wales, except the representatives of the Universities, were required by an Act of 1711 to be possessed of landed property, worth £600 a year for a knight of the shire, £300 a year for a burgess. Heirs of peers and of men qualified to be knights of the shire were exempted. This regulation was largely inoperative because candidates arranged with their lawyers to acquire the nominal title to sufficient landed property for the period of the election, and to hand it back thereafter.[1] Yet the figures show that most members observed the spirit as well as the letter of the law, and it must have deterred many bourgeois aspirants from the path of politics. In 1838 the law was amended so as to make no distinction between landed and other property.[2] In 1858 it was repealed,[3] and from that date there was no legal property qualification for members of Parliament. There were, however, two practical qualifications that were indispensable. Elections were very expensive, before 1832 because of individual bribery, after 1832 because of collective bribery, gradually softened into the modern practice which requires the Member to be a fairy godmother to all the charities and good works in his constituency. Even the official expenses of the election are prohibitive to a man of ordinary means. In our period no party organisation paid these expenses for a candidate, though before 1832 a borough patron might elect a man free of expense. Even in this

---

[1] Porritt, The Unreformed House of Commons, Vol.1. pp.166 - 76.

[2] Ibid., p.176

[3] Ibid., pp.176 - 81.

case, the elected member had to devote the period of the session to Parliamentary business, for which he received no pay. Wealth was therefore indispensable to the politician.

The other thing requisite was leisure. The manufacturer or merchant who, however wealthy, found it necessary to attend to his business was excluded from Parliament, since Parliament would keep him away from his business. This applied with still greater force to the professional man who had a practice to maintain, although the legal profession found it possible to flit from House to Chambers and from Chambers to Court without too much strain. On the other hand, sessions were shorter then than now (January 27 to June 10 in 1818; February 4 to July 29 in 1864) and members, being unpaid and not much under party control, were not very conscientious in their attendance. A few active business men therefore found it possible to combine business and political careers. But it remains true that most members of an unpaid Parliament must be men who live on rent, interest or dividends. In other words, Parliament was for the leisure class, and one of the most valuable features of our analysis (with that of Dr. Thomas) is the light thrown on the change in the nature of this class during the period.

At the beginning of the century the chief source of unearned income was landed property. The landowners were the predominant element in the leisure class. Other men might be rich, but only by constant attendance to business. Landowners could be rich while attending only to politics or the grouse moors or the

trail of the fox. Even at that time there were other kinds of unearned income, notably interest on government and bank stock, and, increasingly, dividends from joint stock companies, first the East India Company, then canal, gas, and later still railway companies. These were companies with limited liability, and all required to be incorporated by special act of Parliament. No joint stock company could be established without this assistance, though many sprang up in defiance of the law.[1] After 1825 joint stock companies were permitted, but their shareholders were in the position of partners with unlimited liability. Investors were therefore reluctant to invest in companies which had not obtained limited liability by special act. The capital of other companies was normally subscribed by people actively concerned in the business, and therefore responsible for their own financial security.

The legislation of 1855 - 8, which conferred limited liability on joint stock companies in general, began the modern general separation of control from ownership, and the great growth of the class living on the proceeds of business with which it has no active connection. This meant a great change (already begun by the earlier investments) in the nature of the leisured class. Land and rent played a steadily diminishing, stocks and dividends an increasing part in the economic support

---

[1] For a good account of the whole subject, see H. A. Shannon in Economic History, Vol. II, pp. 267-291, 396-419.

of the class. As shareholders, people could be supported by many different kinds of industry, as well as land, at the same time. It was possible even to hold a number of directorships at once, and to combine these with life in a country house. Hence a gradual and imperceptible change in the character of upper class incomes. The repeal of the corn-laws at last had its effect (as Punch said, it went against the grain). But while the rent-roll dwindled, the income from investments in commerce or industry could increase, without there being any apparent change in the life of the country seat or the status of its inhabitants. There could arise an ambiguous class of people who lived in country houses, but not on their rents. To an ever increasing extent they would be shareholders and even directors. Here is the explanation of the phenomenon revealed by Dr. Thomas - the great increase in the representatives of finance, commerce and industry in Parliament, while the fall in the number of landowners was relatively slight.

Our own statistics have shown that the newer type of member, the representative of the new kind of leisure class, was a member of the transitional class not merely by occupation, but in most cases by birth also. It was not the founder of the family fortunes in trade or industry that sat in Parliament, but his son. But where a commercial or industrial member was not the son of a man in similar occupation, his father was usually a landowner, not one of the "labouring poor". In many cases the

members father was one of those who combined landowning with banking (e.g. the fathers of H.Drummond, G.C. and G.G.Glyn, J.A.Smith, M.T.Smith, and so on); with manufacturing (William Marshall), with the practice of the law (Sir B.Hall), with brewing, newspaper owning, commerce, the bench or the civil service.

This fact gives further emphasis to the leisure class character of the House of Commons. The industrious founder of a family, though he acquired wealth and often, in his later years, leisure was unfitted by education and habits for a career in patrician politics. His son, destined from birth for leisure, was to the Parliamentary manner born too.

Here is the explanation of the social change described in the last chapter. If the upper class slowly widened its basis so as to include the elements we have called the transitional class, it was because the facilities for leisured existence had increased. Merchants and manufacturers, like bankers and East India directors, were increasingly men of leisure, increasingly free of the odour of mill or counting-house. Those plebeians who were born to this leisure might, with assistance, grow up indistinguishable from the patricians whose families had not worked since the Conquest. Professional men like physicians, journalists and men of letters were accepted in this society because, though they worked, their work had much in common with other men's leisure, and circumstances had conspired to place the emphasis on the type of mind rather than the source

of income.

The House of Commons was, after all, a Club, the best in Europe, and there would be little joy in it for a member who because of his plebeian stamp was ostracized by the others. "While the well-born politicians of the Georgian era were ready to welcome any member of a family which they socially recognised, they knew the secret of making public life uncomfortable to the vulgar herd".[1] The vulgar herd might take the House by storm, but not easily by infiltration.

---

1 Porritt, op.cit., Vol 1, p .524.

CHAPTER 11B.

THE SCHOOLS OF ENGLAND.

English society as we have depicted it was governed by a system of values appropriate to a leisure class. Men and women were judged, not by their standards of work, but by their ability to use their leisure in ways approved by custom and by the class which had had the longest experience in that way of life. To achieve a high social standing, the candidate must know how to behave with restraint and decorum, to speak English "with a charming rhythmical lightness and lilt," to display tact in social intercourse and the taste of a cultivated mind. Neither professional skill nor the most valuable contributions to the expansion of the textile industry could compensate for the absence of these. This was inevitable in a society governed by a leisure class. In the world of the future, where leisure will be widely and equally distributed, there is no doubt that the great semi-leisure class, comprising the whole of society, will insist on taking these leisure values very largely into account in determining

social standing and reputation.

In the nineteenth century this yardstick was applied naturally and inevitably to every candidate for social position. The Hudsons were not accepted in society. Lord Leigh couldn't stand the Manchester School because they weren't gentlemen. The textile magnates at Buxton were without the manner of thinking or behaviour which gave the real charm to Society. But the actress Eliza Farren came to be called the most accomplished lady in the peerage, and Lady Dorothy Nevill testified to the acceptance in Society of men of cultivated minds. The economic groups which rose greatly in social estimation were those which had opportunities for such cultivation, arising either out of the occupations themselves or from the leisure which they afforded.

There can be no doubt therefore that the extension of the boundaries of the upper and governing class was necessarily accompanied by a process of assimilation, through which the newcomers were initiated into the "manner of thinking and behaviour that gives the real charm to Society" The initiation could take many forms. But we are here concerned to examine only one, possibly the most important - that afforded by the educational system of England.

That system, in the early decades of the nineteenth century, was as unsystematic as most English institutions are generally supposed to be. In its chief forms it had grown

up during and after the Reformation as a substitute for, or revival of, the medieval educational arrangements. Kings, City Companies, Deans and Chapters, private recipients of Abbey lands, municipal corporations, pious business men who remembered their birthplaces, and sometimes, in default of these, the body of parishioners, had built schoolhouses and endowed their foundations with lands, tithes, or other fixed sources of income. Governing bodies of various kinds were set up, and were perpetuated from generation to generation. Statutes decided on the conditions of admission and the manner and substance of the teaching. At the beginning of the nineteenth century these arrangements made in the sixteenth and seventeenth were still the basis of the English educational system.

These endowed schools, which were governed subject to charters or trusts which could be enforced by the courts, were to that extent "public" schools. Contrasted with them were the ephemeral private schools which anyone (usually a clergyman) could establish and maintain without any outside control or supervision. We shall see that the two classes were not mutually exclusive. And just before the beginning of our period the two great school societies, National and British, began the widespread establishment of elementary schools using the monitorial system of Lancaster and Bell.

We shall not be concerned with the last class, which were of a popular character; nor with the private schools, except

incidentally. It is among the endowed schools that we shall seek the solution of our problem.

In 1816 Mr. Nicholas Carlisle, Secretary of the Society of Antiquaries and Assistant Librarian to the King, published in the Gentleman's Magazine and also circulated to the Head Masters of all the known Grammar Schools of England and Wales a questionnaire relating to the history and character of the schools. The information returned, which was "proportionate to his most ardent expectations," was published in 1818 in two volumes entitled A Concise Description of the Endowed Grammar Schools in England and Wales. This cannot be regarded as an exhaustive enumeration, as a comparison with the school chapters in the Victoria County Histories will show, but it will serve as a sufficient background against which to place the handful of schools that reached the first rank.

Carlisle enumerates 474 schools.[1] There is no significance in the number, since it includes great schools, small schools, and others so far decayed as to have no real existence. The only way to get a picture of the mass of schools is to classify them by various

---

1 He says 475 in the introduction (p.xliv), but includes a few institutions that are not schools, and sometimes counts two schools as one. Thus I make the total 474. The general description which follows is based on a study of Carlisle's work. To avoid too frequent footnotes, we may say that the counties are there placed in alphabetical order (with Wales at the end) and the schools in alphabetical order in each county. An analysis of Carlisle's information is given in the appendix of the present work.

criteria, and use this classification to explain the relative importance of some and unimportance of others.

We have already said that most - almost all - had been founded[1] in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and the various types of founder have been mentioned. Great variety is to be found in the types of governing body. Commonly the founder had established a corporate body of trustees or governors, holding office for life and filling vacancies by co-option. This was done, for example, at Harrow [2] and Shrewsbury. [3] Sometimes the governorships were hereditary, as at Chelmsford, where they belonged to the families of Petre, Mildmay, Tirrell and another Mildmay. Sometimes they were attached to certain offices, whose holders were ex officio the governing body. Thus Lucton, in Herefordshire, was ruled by "the Preacher of the Charter-house, the Rector of St. Botolph without Bishopsgate, the Rector of St. Peter's in Cornhill, the Preacher of Gray's Inn, the President of Sion College, the School-master of the Charter-house, the Common Serjeant of the City of London, and the Master of the Merchant Taylors' Free School, all for the time being."[4]

Among the commonest types of governing body were the City Companies of London. There were famous London schools under this régime - such as Merchant Taylors, and St. Paul's (under the Mercers); and many not yet famous provincial ones, such as Tunbridge (Skinners), Aldenham (Brewers), Oundle (Grocers), Newport, Shropshire (Haberdashers) and many more.

---

1 Or refounded. Medievalists would insist on this point.
2 Carlisle, op.cit., vol.ii. p.126.
3 Ibid., vol.ii. pp.377-8.
4 Ibid., vol.i. p.503.

Still more common was government by the municipal corporation, as at Leicester, Lichfield, Stafford and Abingdon. In cathedral cities there was commonly a school subject to the Dean and Chapter, as at Peterborough, Hereford, and Gloucester. In some cases the school was controlled by a College in one of the Universities. This happened at Stone in Staffordshire (Trinity, Cambridge), at Uttoxeter (also Trinity, Cambridge) and at Northleach (Queen's, Oxford). More commonly the College shared control with another body, the latter concerning itself with finance, the former with the appointment of the Master and the supervision of the studies. Bedford and Shrewsbury are examples of this. There were other less common constitutions, in which various degrees of authority were exercised by the inhabitants of the parish, the incumbent, the Lord of the Manor, the Bishop, the Lord Chancellor, the founder's heir, and others.

None of these constitutions suggests itself as patently better suited to its purpose than the others. Public spirit might or might not be found in any of these types of authority, or might be found in one generation and not in another.

We turn, then, to the endowments. It might be expected that the schools with the greatest endowments, or whose possessions greatly increased in value, would rise to pre-eminence over those less well endowed. This happened in some cases. Lawrence Sheriff endowed his school at Rugby with lands which then, in 1567, lay outside London. With the growth of the metropolis these lands appreciated in value. Carlisle gives the revenue of Rugby as £2,469.13.6. [1] Exactly the same good fortune happened to Bedford, which had £6,000 per annum or more, but not all of this could be used by the school. There was a tradition[2]

1. Ibid., vol. ii. p. 676.
2. Ibid., vol. ii. p. 769.

that at their foundation Birmingham Grammar School chose to be endowed with land, and King's Norton School with money, with the result that the former, whose lands were in Birmingham itself, had a revenue in 1818 of £3000, and King's Norton one of £15. Shrewsbury had £2,500 a year, St Paul's £5,300, Charterhouse £22,000 and Christ's Hospital £43,386. Some other fairly important schools had adequate revenues, and many very unimportant ones could be represented by Rock, near Bewdley, with £5.14.0., or Middlewich with £11.10.0. Sufficient endowment was therefore one of the factors that might raise a school to importance.

But what are we to say to such contrasts as this? - Harrow, at the height of its reputation, enjoyed between £700 and £800 a year, while Childrey in Berkshire, with £1,000, had ceased to do anything but teach the village children reading and writing; the master, who "barely possessed these attainments himself", was paid £8 a year. [1] Three almsmen were given £3.3.0. each, but nothing is said of what happened to the enormous surplus. There were many less glaring examples of abuse. The master of the Grammar School at Wellingborough received £37.10.0. a year, but had no pupils. At Risley, Derbyshire, there were a few pupils, but they were entrusted to the care of an under master, who received the use of a house; while the salary of £200 was enjoyed by a sinecurist.

The incomes of the Masters might give some clue to the success or failure of schools; but unfortunately the bare figure of the salary does not. A small school was usually a combination of two schools. It was an endowed school for the children of the parish (or other

---

1 Ibid., vol. 1, pp.31-4

foundationers [illegible] and a private school in respect of the boarders, who were the Master's own concern and whom he could charge what he liked and teach as he liked, just as the keeper of any private school did. Thus the master's income was partly a professional income of fees which would depend on his own skill and reputation. There were flourishing grammar schools at Northampton, where the salary was £33 per annum and a house, and at Hereford, where it was £20 and a house. Both had considerable numbers of boarders. Yet at Derby there were no boarders, only six or seven day boys, and the salary was £70. The amount of the endowment, however, "is a profound secret with The Corporation, who positively refuse any information respecting the School". [1]

The next point to be examined is the type of education. Carlisle calls his schools Grammar Schools, a name that always denoted schools devoted to the teaching of the classical languages. This curriculum was a valuable social touchstone. The leisured classes, up to the beginning of our period, believed in a classical education as appropriate to gentlemen. The classes that earned their living by trade or industry regarded it at best as an extravagant luxury. Where, for reasons shortly to be explained, a school was filled entirely by boys of the latter class, the demand to abandon a classical for an "English" or "commercial" education was insistent, and very commonly effective. Where the parents were poor, the schooling was of short duration and consequently elementary - nothing but the three R's. A very large number of Carlisle's so-called Grammar Schools had been thus converted into English or commercial schools. Take any county [illegible]

---

1 Ibid., vol.i. p.218.

at random - Northamptonshire; this had happened at Findon, Higham Ferrers, Preston Capes, Rothwell and Wellingborough (where the classical part of the school had become a sinecure). In other places there were two or three classical scholars amid greater numbers of others. At Mansfield, in Nottinghamshire, where the boys of the parish could have had a classical education free, their parents preferred to pay for an English one, and the classics were no longer taught.

The same consideration affected the attitude to the Universities. It might be supposed that schools possessing scholarships and exhibitions to the Universities would be greedily frequented. It is true that the less wealthy members of the upper and upper middle classes were happy to travel the golden road through Winchester College to New College, or through Eton College to King's, those two University foundations being monopolised by Wykehamists and Etonians respectively. Merchant Taylors' is said to owe its eminence to its university advantages; [1] and the Mercers' School to have died a natural death for lack of them. [2] At Calne the university endowments were the sole reason for the continuance of the grammar school.[3]

Most of the great schools had these advantages, but we cannot overlook numerous cases like those of Lewisham and Hertford, with many university scholarships which were seldom if ever applied for because of the preference for a commercial education.

The last constitutional factor to be examined is the regulation of entry to the schools. Here we may give a generalised picture. In so many cases as to be almost every case, the free classical

---

1 Ibid., vol.ii. p.62.
2 Ibid., vol.ii, p.44.
3 Ibid., vol. ii. p.741.

education endowed by the founder was confined to the children of the parish, the borough, or a few adjoining parishes. In some cases the master was forbidden to take paying pupils from further afield. Except in sizeable towns there was, in the nineteenth century, very little response from the parochial population to the offer of a free classical education. The school at Stourbridge decayed because it was confined to the Classics.[1] There were no longer any foundationers at Bewdley for the same reason. The Master at Doncaster was broken-hearted because of the inhabitants' indifference to the classics. In some cases, as we have seen, the Master defied or got round the statutes and changed the school into an English one. But wherever he was allowed, and that was in most cases, he gave classical tuition to the boarders from afar that were taken into his house. From these he derived a large part, often the main part, of his income, and he accordingly gave them the better part of his labour. They were called indiscriminately "boarders" and "private pupils". Where the foundationers dwindled to a handful who were taught the three R's by an undermaster, the school was hardly to be distinguished from a private school. But in some cases, owing to the work of a great master or succession of masters, this private part of the school was so well built up that it numbered its pupils by the hundred and drew them from all parts of England. This happened, as we shall see, to the parochial schools at Harrow and Rugby.

Here we encounter the accidental factor of personality. There is no simple rule of thumb by which the relative success and eminence of a few of the endowed grammar schools can be explained. But when we have eliminated all the non-classical schools, most of

---

1 Ibid., vol.II. p.772.

the poorly endowed and of those with no special connection with the Universities, and all (except in biggish towns) which were open only to the local inhabitants, we are left with a residue where important differences can be explained only by personal and accidental factors.

In a few places these causes had filled what was originally a small local school with hundreds of boarders. These schools then came to resemble the few great institutions - Winchester, Eton, Westminster - which had been national in scope from their foundation. In other places a large local population combined with other favourable factors to fill a school with great numbers of day boys. This happened to the grammar schools of Manchester and Birmingham. In still others, a great boarding school developed without having quite a national reputation, but drawing boys mostly from one section of the country. This could be said of Blundell's at Tiverton, of Repton, Louth and a few others.

There were some boarding schools, expensive and classical, that were nevertheless small and inconspicuous. They were not distinguished from the large and famous schools by their social character. We note, for instance, that the boarders at Shrewsbury paid fifty guineas a year, while here by, at Newport, the master's private pupils paid sixty, and at Ashby de la Zouch seventy. Newport and Ashby thus catered for families just as wealthy as those who sent their sons to Shrewsbury. The distinction lay in the ages of the boys and the stage of education. Boys went to

the great schools at twelve, thirteen or even later. Most of the smaller schools had come to specialise in the preparatory stages. Of Ashford, Kent, we are told the school "acquired a very high reputation some years since, under the care of the Revd. Stephen Barrett, then Master; most of the sons of the neighbouring gentry having received the early part of their education under him".[1] Many others can be shown to have provided young gentlemen with "the early part of their education" - High Wycombe, for instance, Newport (Isle of Wight), Hemsworth (Yorks.) and Bodmin. It is said of the free grammar school at Rugeley that "most of the Gentlemen of the neighbourhood have received the rudiments of their Education at this useful Seminary."[2]

These preparatory schools could be paralleled by a great number of purely private schools serving the same purpose, and often possessing considerable reputations. The endowed schools of this class were really double schools - endowed grammar schools for the local inhabitants, private preparatory schools for the boarders. The social questions involved in this combination will be considered in the next chapter.

The elimination of these various classes leaves us with a handful of famous foundations. They were classical, secondary, usually well-endowed, and they were boarding-schools. A day school might, in London, draw its pupils from a select class. In a large

---

1 Ibid, vol.1, p.561

2 Ibid, vol II, p.489

provincial town it might be exclusive, though less exclusive than in London. But elsewhere a day school of any size would necessarily, for mathematical reasons, comprise a social mixture in which the upper class could not bulk largely. A boarding-school could draw upon the whole country, even the whole world, and its clientele would be a horizontal, not a vertical slice of society. Hence the natural association between the great boarding-schools and the thinly-spread social elite. As contrasted with the small private or half-private schools that taught young gentlemen the rudiments, these schools were "public". In the strict sense a few of them, like Harrow, were private schools grafted upon a very slender public root. The general description was taken from the Collegiate institutions which were public trusts. Even at Harrow the form of government, if not the character of the school population, was derived directly from the will of the sixteenth century founder.

The Edinburgh Review, in 1810, defined the Public School as "an endowed place of education, of old standing, to which the sons of gentlemen resort in considerable numbers, and where they continue to reside, from eight or nine, to eighteen years of age. The characteristic features of these schools are, their antiquity, the numbers, and the ages of the young people who are educated in them. We include, in the term of public schools, not only Eton, Winchester and Westminster, but Charter-House, St. Paul's school, Merchant Taylors, and every school in England, at all conducted on the plan of the three first. The great

schools of Scotland we do not call public schools; because, in these, the mixture of domestic life gives them a widely different character".[1] The Quarterly Review in 1834 more shortly describes the public schools as "in general the seminaries of instruction for the hereditary aristocracy of the country". We shall have occasion to question the accuracy of this statement.

The Public Schools Commission which reported in 1864 investigated nine great schools to which the title of Public School had been appropriate: Winchester, Eton, Westminster, Harrow, Rugby, Shrewsbury, Charterhouse, Merchant Taylors' and St.Paul's. The last two, being day schools, stood somewhat apart from the others (although Westminster had day boys), so that the number has sometimes been reduced to seven. Each of these needs a word of introduction.

Winchester and Eton were medieval foundations. William of Wykeham, Bishop of Winchester, started something new in education by founding a double institution, a school in his episcopal city and a college at Oxford. His St.Mary College of Winchester in Oxenford was so far a new departure in method and arrangement as to have retained to this day the name of New College. At Winchester he established a junior college as a nursery for the other. The places in the Oxford college were entirely reserved for the products of Winchester. The school at Winchester,[2] planned on a generous scale, has nothing of the parochial in its arrangements. A Warden and ten fellows were the self-perpetuating governing body. A Master and an Usher (or under-master) were responsible for the teaching. Seventy poor scholars

1 Edinburgh Review vol.XVi,pp.327,330

2 See H.C.Adams, Wykehamica, Ch.11,111; A.F.Leach, A History of Winchester College, Ch.Vl - Vlll; A.K.Cook, About Winchester College, passim.

were to enjoy the benefits of this teaching and of residence in College. They were, in practice, nominated in rotation by the six electors - the Wardens of Winchester and New College, the Sub-Warden and the Headmaster of Winchester, and two Fellows of New College called the posers. Though there was a statutory preference for Founder's kin the entrance to College depended otherwise purely on the favour of the electors. The latter also annually arranged the names of the senior scholars on a roll which determined the order of their succession to scholarships, and ultimately Fellowships, at New College.

Wykeham provided also that a few "filii nobilium et valentium personarum" should have access to the teaching of the College, provided they were no expense to the foundation. Whether this was the legal origin of the Commoners is a matter of controversy; all that need be said is that in later times (for long before our period), there existed side by side with the scholars a body of commoners who were not paid for by the endowment, who were taught in the College but lodged elsewhere and paid fees sufficient to cover what they received. They look like a grand counterpart of the private pupils we have seen in the small schools. Winchester, in Carlisle's time, had about 200 boys, scholars and commoners together. [1]

Eton was founded by Henry VI in 1440 in imitation of William of Wykeham's achievement. [2] As New College was connected with Winchester, so King's at Cambridge was founded in connection with Eton, and its places were reserved for Etonians. In its final form the copy closely resembled the model - a Provost and ten Fellows, a Master

---

1 Carlisle, op.cit., vol.ii. p.461.

2 H.C.Maxwell Lyte, A History of Eton College, ch. 1,2; L.Cust. A History of Eton College, ch. 1, 3.

and an Usher, seventy scholars; as well as the clerks, chaplains and choristers which Winchester had too. The elections, both into College at Eton and from Eton to King's, were on the same principle as at Winchester. Moreover there was a provision for non-foundationers or commensales of two classes - a privileged patrician class which disappeared in the seventeenth century and an ordinary class of oppidans who came to form, like the Winchester commoners, the great majority of the pupils. They lodged at houses in the town and paid the College fees for their tuition. At the beginning of our period Collegers and Oppidans together numbered 471.[1]

Westminster School [2] was re-established by Henry VIII after his dissolution of the Abbey, abolished under Mary and established again by Elizabeth in 1560. It was a part of the collegiate church which took the place of the old monastery; it was governed by the Dean and Chapter and the school had no distinct revenues of its own. An upper and an under master were provided for, as well as forty King's (originally Queen's) Scholars on the foundation. Outside this number, permission was originally given to take up to eighty Town Boys at their own expense. This number was generally exceeded, and they boarded with the masters. The system differed, in theory, from that of Winchester and Eton. The King's Scholars were selected from among the Town Boys by a competitive examination of the medieval kind, the disputation of challenger and opposer in questions of Latin grammar. Yet it is much doubted whether the elections depended any less upon favouritism than at the other two colleges. The Town

---

1 Carlisle, op.cit., vol.i. p.82.

2 Ibid., vol. ii. pp. 98-116.

oys were mostly boarders in the masters' houses, but partly day boys
ving in London. The school possessed no college of its own in one of
e Universities, but it had valuable Studentships at Christ Church, and
me much less valuable scholarships to Trinity, Cambridge. There were
out 300 boys in the school at the beginning of our period. [1]

Winchester, in the old West Saxon capital, and Eton and
estminster, next to the royal residences and having close contacts with
oyalty, were in some ways a class by themselves. Harrow [2] belongs to an
tirely different type. John Lyon's foundation of 1571 was hardly to be
stinguished from many a local grammar school that afterwards decayed.
e free scholars were to be the boys of the parish, and "foreigners" might
accepted only in such numbers "as the whole....may be well taught and
plied." [3] Rugby, [4] too, founded by Lawrence Sheriff in 1567, was intended
r the boys of Rugby, Brownsover and adjoining parishes, though others
ght be admitted. Rugby, as we saw, was lucky enough to own lands in
at came to be London. Harrow was poorly endowed. Both had risen to
inence by the beginning of our period through the labours of able masters,
gby to become what Carlisle calls a "splendid seminary", and Harrow "one
the most celebrated and frequented Public Seminaries of Classical
arning now flourishing in this Kingdom," "surveyed with filial veneration
a very considerable proportion of the Higher and Distinguished Orders
Society at the present day." [5]

"W.L.C.", The Public Schools, p.137.
P.M.Thornton, Harrow School and its Surroundings, passim.
Carlisle, op.cit., vol.ii. p.136.
W.H.D. Rouse, A History of Rugby School, passim.
Carlisle, op.cit. vol.ii. p.126.

Shrewsbury, [1] more properly "the Royal Free Grammar School of King Edward the Sixth," was founded by that King in 1551 out of the revenues of some dissolved collegiate churches. The statutes were entirely altered in 1798 by Act of Parliament, and in their new form they provided for a governing body filling vacancies by co-option, but for the appointment of Head and Second Masters by St. John's College, Cambridge, where moreover the school possessed many scholarships and exhibitions. The sons of burgesses of Shrewsbury were the free boys, and others were admitted at their own charges. Dr. Samuel Butler, who became Headmaster in 1798, greatly increased the reputation (especially the intellectual reputation) of the school, whose numbers are given by Carlisle [2] as 130, of whom about a third were foundationers.

Charterhouse, [3] whose name, the English corruption of Chartreuse, takes us back to the Carthusian monks of mediæval London, was refounded as a School and an almshouse ("Hospital") in 1611. Thomas Sutton of London, citizen and girdler, had at several removes acquired the property of the monastic house which was dissolved in 1538, and this property became the endowment of the new institution. The Governors filled vacancies in their number by co-option, and in the number of scholars by choice in rotation. There were at first forty scholars, increased by the beginning of our period to forty-two. As in other schools, there was a still greater number of oppidans, so that Carlisle gives the whole number as 212. It was not till after the

---

1 W.L.C., The Public Schools, pp. 193-254; C.E. Pascoe (ed), Every-day Life in Our Public Schools, pp.143-66; Carlisle, op.cit., vol.ii. pp. 374-96.

2 Vol. ii, p.388.

3. Anon., Our Public Schools, pp. 314-48; Carlisle, op.cit., vol.ii pp. 2-19.

end of our period (in 1872) that the school was removed from its historic home in London to a rural refuge at Godalming.

The other two schools, Merchant Taylors'[1] and St.Paul's[2] were of a different character in that they were day schools, and that the whole complement of boys was in each case provided for by the foundation. Thus at Merchant Taylors' (founded by that Company in 1561, and governed by it) there were to be 250 boys, of whom 100 were taught freely, 50 at 2/2 a quarter, and the rest at 5/- a quarter. St. Paul's was founded by Dean Colet in 1512 for 153 free boys, and placed under the government of the Mercers' Company. Schools of this kind would not have achieved eminence elsewhere than in London, but placed in the midst of such a great population they were able to do so.

For various reasons, some of which will be considered hereafter, these nine schools came about the 1830's to enjoy the increasing confidence of the public, or at least of that portion of the public which had access to them. The result was, in one direction, a number of moves to found new schools on the same lines, and in another to develop some of the existing endowed schools into great public schools of the approved type.

The intensification of religious feeling, a feature of the end of the eighteenth century and the first half of the nineteenth, led to the establishment of schools to foster particular religious

---

1 Merchant Taylors' School (publ.Blackwell,1929), see Bibliography; Carlisle op.cit., vol.II,pp. 49-69; C.E.Pascoe (ed),op.cit 278-92

2 C.E.Pascoe, op.cit., pp.263-76; Carlisle,op.cit.,vol.II pp.70-97

views. In the case of the Roman Catholics it was no latter-day revival that produced educational development, but persecution by revolutionary France, in conjunction with increased toleration in England. Since the Reformation, English Catholics of the upper classes had been educated at English seminaries established in France, notably at Douai and St.Omer. The French Revolution and the wars made these Catholic Englishmen doubly suspect to the government, and they took refuge in England, where the school of St.Omer, after temporary sojourn at Bruges and then in Shropshire, settled at Stonyhurst, while St.Gregory's of Douai went to Downside and the school of Dieulouard to Ampleforth. Of these, Downside and Ampleforth belonged to Benedictine monks, Stonyhurst to the Jesuits.[1]

Since the Clarendon code there has been a religious exclusiveness in the English governing class. Catholics, although deprived of political influence, might enjoy social prestige and be accounted members of the upper class. But Nonconformists, who were not altogether excluded from political life, had been quite shut out of the upper ranks of society. In the eighteenth century the secession of Wesley and his followers from the established Church, and the evangelical revival in the latter, made a bridge between Anglicanism and Nonconformity; this, with the growth of tolerance and the increasing influence of the Whig party and Presbyterian Scotland, slowly opened the doors of good society to Dissent. In these circumstances a public school for Dissenters seemed

---

1 John Rodgers, The Old Public Schools of England, pp.101-6

necessary, and a London Committee of ministers and others opened it at Mill Hill in 1808.[1] The education was essentially classical, but inevitably broadened in scope and outlook by Nonconformist academic tradition. The ancient Universities were still closed[2] to these new public school boys on religious grounds, but London University soon came to fill the gap, and the Anglicans at Mill Hill, who were many, had access to Oxford and Cambridge from the start.

Religious parties within the Church of England became acutely conscious of their rivalries after the launching of the Oxford Movement in 1833, and a spate of new public schools was the consequence. One novelty in most of these was the system of ownership and government. They were not endowed but proprietary schools, that is, the ownership was vested in a joint stock company - a method that had been used by the two colleges in London and can be traced to Bentham.[3] The first of these schools, Cheltenham,[4] was founded in 1841 under Evangelical auspices, and was largely a day school. The High Churchmen were prompt to retaliate with Radley[5] in 1847 and Lancing[6] in 1848.

Religion was not the only or the most significant motive in this new development, as some examples of more worldly considerations will show. Marlborough was founded in 1843 to educate

---

1. N.G.Brett-James, History of Mill Hill School.
2. Oxford till 1854, Cambridge degrees till 1856 (but tuition and residence at Cambridge had been possible for them before)
3. Adamson. English Education 1789-1902. p. 105.
4. Great Public Schools. (see Bibliography) pp.121-40.
5. Public Schools Year Book (1912 ed) pp. 233-4.
6. Ibid pp. 169-70 - Lancing was part of Woodall's elaborate sch

the sons of clergymen "in an inexpensive, practical and simple way"[1] Rossall followed in 1844 for the purpose of "giving an education to the sons of clergymen and others, similar to that of the Great Public Schools, but of a more comprehensive character, and at less cost"[2] Wellington opened its doors in 1859, shortly after the Crimean War, "for the benefit of the families of deceased officers who were left in reduced circumstances"[3] Clifton was launched by some Bristol citizens in 1862 "for the purpose of providing for the sons of gentlemen a thoroughly good and liberal education at a moderate cost"[4]

These schools stood midway, in an economic sense, between the great expensive institutions and that remarkable benefaction of Edward VI, Christ's Hospital,[5] popularly known as the Bluecoat School and appealing to the imagination by reason of its picturesque and archaic uniform. This was founded in 1552, it was and is a boarding school, and it gave a classical education to those who were fitted for it. But both boarding and tuition were entirely free. The social question suggested by this endowment will be considered hereafter.

Of the older schools that were raised to distinction in the nineteenth century, Uppingham[6] stands out because of Thring. Many others entered on a new lease of life, but it would serve

---

1. Anon, Our Public Schools, p.259
2. Staunton, The Great Schools of England, p.399
3. J.L.Bevir, The Making of Wellington College p.2
4. O.F.Christie, A History of Clifton College 1860-1934 p.17
5. Edmund Blunden, Christ's Hospital, a Retrospect; C.E.Pascoe (ed) op.cit.,pp 295-314; Staunton op.cit.pp 356-89
6. Public Schools Year Book (1912 ed) pp 294-7; Carlisle op.cit.,vol.II, pp 323-39

no purpose to particularise them, since the effects of their development were felt chiefly after the end of our period.

Another group should be briefly mentioned. The Army, Navy and Honourable East India Company had special schools and colleges to train the cadets in their respective services. There were the Royal Military Academy, Woolwich, for officers in the artillery and the engineers, and the Royal Military College, Sandhurst, for cavalry and infantry officers. The senior service had its Royal Naval College, Portsmouth, and the East India Company maintained the East India College and East India College School at Hertford. They were to be succeeded by Haileybury after the dissolution of John Company. Entrance to these institutions was naturally determined by the conditions of entrance to the services themselves, and since the nature of these lies outside our province, we shall not pay any special attention to the seminaries attached to them.

From this brief survey there emerges the fact that the Public Schools were, on the whole, boarding schools teaching the classical languages, that they were large, hallowed by antique associations, sometimes well-endowed but often expensive. There were exceptions to all but one of these rules. The concentration on Latin and Greek to the more or less complete exclusion of other subjects was as a law of the Medes and Persians.

To discover why classical learning should be regarded as the mark of a gentleman and an appropriate schooling for the

youth of the leisure class would take us back to the Roman Empire. Roman, medieval and Renaissance influences had shaped the studies that were laid down for English grammar schools after the Reformation. In so far as these studies had been intended as a professional training, it was a training of the clergy. Laymen were not expected to develop any earning capacity from this basis. Such an education might lead, through the Universities, to one of the learned professions, including the church. It was supposed to develop the forensic powers and form the political background of aspirants to the Senate, as Parliament could be called in literary language. And in so far as it was the standard education of the upper class, it was a common bond among members of that class, and an indispensable one to any pseudo-patrician whose status was at all equivocal.

A public school education was, in short, an education for leisure. Those who benefited most from it were qualified for learned and scholarly pursuits, whether as means of livelihood or merely of amusement. The rest forgot most of their Latin and all their Greek, but their incomes had been assured by the great men whose portraits hung round their halls.

Classical education could, of course, be obtained outside the Public Schools. Small grammar schools, private schools and family tutors could provide it. But, as we shall see, the upper class during our period steadily abandoned these alternatives. As the hallmark of the public school became the more necessary in polite society, and as this kind of education slowly broadened

its character so as to fit men to earn a little as well as to spend much, provision had to be made for people whose economic position had failed to keep pace with their social pretensions. Hence the newer schools that provided a "liberal education at moderate cost," and were especially kind to the sons of clergymen and fallen officers. Hence the development of exclusive day schools and the admission of day boys to many boarding schools. We see here a reflection of the growth and expansion of the leisure class, and we can discern also a meeting ground for the leisured and the not-so-leisured whose work did not unfit them for the enjoyment of good society.

CHAPTER IV

CLASS DISTINCTIONS IN EDUCATION.

At the present day, restrictions upon educational opportunity are generally assumed to arise from costs which poor parents cannot afford. A Public School education is expensive. It is therefore all the more necessary to emphasise the relative unimportance of this factor early in the nineteenth century. Society was in an earlier stage of its development than now. The significant discrimination in schooling was not against the really poor, who were politically unimportant, but against the urban lower middle classes, who were near enough to the chance of "bettering themselves" through education to resent being deprived of it. In so far as Public Schools and, in a general way, grammar schools provided this opportunity, the opportunity was restricted to those who chose to take advantage of a classical education. This education would open the way to good society, politics, and at a long range to success in some of the professions. But it offered no immediate prospect of money-making. It was for that reason that the "commercial" classes had to forego its advantages, even when they were available free of cost.

The newly enriched members of the middle class were not only able to pay whatever fees were required, but also to disperse with a utilitarian schooling for their sons. Papa was rich because he had learned in a hard school, but that hard school had unfitted him for leisured society. His son could be fitted for it by being educated for leisure. The social ladder might be planted in a middle class classical grammar school; but a classical education in patrician company in a great Public School had the social advantages not so

much of a ladder as of an automatic lift.

We shall now examine various kinds of school in the light of these remarks. Under what conditions would upper and middle class boys be found mixing amicably in one school and going away with a common impression left upon them? What would become of middle class boys who imbibed the classics, but in less select company? In what way did the great and famous schools differ from the small local foundations in these respects? An examination of many cases shows that, in general, the larger and more famous schools tended to be instruments of assimilation; whereas the smaller were either confined to pupils of more or less the same class, or else functioned in practice as two separate schools, or, mixing pupils of different classes, witnessed antipathy and even hostility between them.

Among the small schools there were many - often, but not always, preparatory schools - which had been patronised mostly by the upper class. At Midhurst[1] there were sixty boarders, their fees being fifty guineas. But the day-boys did not differ socially from them, for as the education was classical the foundation was not used by "the Poore Mens sons of Midhurst" but "only by the more respectable [illegible]bitants". At Bury St. Edmund's, which was free to the sons of the inhabitants, "a Warrant signed by Three Governors, addressed to the Head Master is necessary for admission, to prevent the intrusion of boys to whom a Classical Education would be of no use, and who might injure the interests of the School" [2]

---

1. Carlisle, op. cit. vol.ii. pp. 606-7
2. Ibid, vol.ii. p. 614.

As the foundationers need not be natives of the place, but might be merely residents, respectable families took up residence at Bury and had no difficulty in procuring the governors' warrant. Thus "the sons of persons of very large fortune are not infrequently educated upon the Foundation". At Beerton, Yorkshire, there were no foundationers; the aim of the school was "to prepare young Gentlemen for the Universities, or some of the Learned Professions".[1] Of many schools the same is said as of Swansea; "many respectable Gentlemen of this Town and Neighbourhood have been educated here".[2]

There were not always governors who would exclude boys "to whom a classical education would be of no use", and when a number of these was taught alongside the "young gentlemen" there were possibilities of discrimination, friction and violence. In some schools the authorities insisted that all should be treated alike, as at Northampton.[3] The statutes at Pontefract were especially explicit, and show that boarders were not always "private pupils"; non-foundationers could be admitted as boarders only "so that such boys be educated at the same times, and in the same Authors, and in the same Schoolroom as the boys of the Foundation, and be mixed with them, according to their ages of proficiency in learning; but the Master shall, on no account, be permitted to take any boys to educate privately, and separate from the other boys, or any of them, nor shall any distinction be made between the boys upon the said Foundation, and the other boys educated by the said Master; either by any

---

1 Ibid, vol. ii, p. 892
2 Ibid, vol. ii, p. 963
3 Ibid, vol. ii, p. 212

badge or mark, or by the place of their sitting in such School-room, or by any other mode of treatment". [1]

Such precautions were not common. What we shall see in the greater schools suggests that they must have been, in many cases, ineffective. Far more usual was the practice, sometimes even enjoined by the governors, of keeping the two classes of pupils separate. At Yoresbridge (Yorks) the "domestic Scholars" were taught privately. [2] At Old Malton (Yorks) the Head Master taught the private pupils, leaving his assistant to instil "the English Grammer, and a little arithmetic" into the foundationers. [3] A different kind of precaution, evidence of the same spirit, is seen in the statutes of Newport, Shropshire: during the holidays the boys "shall not needlessly associate themselves with the Apprentices of the Town or exercise themselves in the streets". [4] Kington, Herefordshire, made formal distinctions among the local inhabitants themselves, charging five shillings for the son of a gentleman, two-and-six for the son of a Yeoman, and one shilling for the son of a poor person. [5] Very generally the boarders were divided, a special class of "parlour boarders" paying higher fees; thus, at Ludlow, boarders paid forty guineas and parlour boarders sixty. [6]

Segregation may have lightened the Master's labour; where it was not introduced there was sometimes acute friction. Enfield [7] had ceased to take boarders "owing to continual disputes

1. Ibid., vol. ii, p. 871
2. Ibid., vol. ii, p. 917
3. Ibid., vol. ii, p. 859
4. Ibid., vol. ii, p. 357
5. Ibid., vol. ii, p. 499
6. Ibid., vol. ii, p. 362
7. Ibid., vol. ii, pp.116-7

between the Private Pupils and the Free Boys". Then the governors were far-sighted enough to forbid the admission of non-foundationers, on the same principle as makes the untutored savage object to even the smallest intrusion of the Palefaces upon his hunting grounds.

In some places the same difficulties had led to a splitting of the school in twain. At Witton,[1] near Northwich, there was an Upper School of ten pupils taught the Classics by the Headmaster, and an entirely separate Lower School of thirty pupils who were given an "English" education by the Second Master. The Grammar School of Birmingham [2] had sufficient funds and public spirit to establish several subsidiary schools for boys and girls in various parts of the town, where the rudiments were taught gratuitously to "some hundreds of poor children", and in addition to erect upon its own land a National school for the same purpose.

We can find three reasons for the general failure of the small schools to achieve a social fusion of their diverse elements. First, they were not great national institutions, so that mere participation in their life could not confer a sort of patent of peerage which would override all other distinctions. The contrast with the greater schools in this respect will soon appear. Secondly, the proportion of upper class pupils in the kind of school we have just been considering was not large enough to make them predominant. At Pontefract there were 16 foundationers, 4 boarders. At Hertford Grammar School there were 40 on the foundation and 30 boarders. At Nuneaton there were usually from 40 to 50 on the foundation and

---

1. Ibid., vol. i. p.136.
2. Ibid., vol. ii. p.641.

from ten to twenty others. Thus the boarders were put on the defensive and, instead of assimilating the others had themselves to resist assimilation. But this hostility would not have existed if there had not been such a great social disparity between the two elements. Whence the third reason: the foundationers were in many of these cases drawn largely from the very poor, and could not even be regarded as of the middle class. Thus one element in a small endowed school was usually the "Poore Mens sons", who almost always wanted an elementary or utiliterian schooling and were separated by a great gulf from the wealthy boarders. The experience of the larger schools suggests that the foundationers of this type could not, for lack of grounding, have taken advantage of the Classical facilities.

Some small schools served upper and middle class purposes, without catering for the labouring poor. Thus Boston Grammar School[1] aimed at preparing the pupils "for the great Public Schools, the Universities or for Commercial business", and though the differences in these objects do not seem to have produced fiction, they were enough to prevent a very close association of different classes. The boys who passed from Boston to the counting house would not bear a very lasting impress of their association with patrician schoolfellows. The factors missing were size, a nation-wide clientèle, and above all a common classical curriculum for all pupils alike.

The Public Schools were large and their members came from the four corners of the Kingdom. Some of them, as we shall

---

1. Ibid., vol. i, p. 789.

see, grew out of small local grammar schools. How then did they escape the conflict between the boarders and the poor local boys? By freezing out the latter. Elementary education was not provided; the poor boys of the parish retired from an alien, uncongenial environment. In their absence, and with a single type of education - leisure class education - prevailing throughout the school, there was an opportunity for a feeling of equality to prevail. Given other favourable circumstances, middle and upper class boys could mix freely and merge their distinctions.

Not that all the so-called Public Schools were nurseries of the aristocracy. Several lesser members of the group, and notably the great day schools, belonged to a humbler rank. But they educated for leisure or the professions (even when they were training boys destined for commerce) and they had a nation-wide reputation, which did confer a certain prestige on their members and thus raise their social status. It was when these advantages were shared with great numbers of well-born boys that the effective assimilation took place.

Dr. Wilson, an historian of Merchant Taylors' School, says that the school "does not affect to enrol among her scholars many of the Mighty or the Noble. Her Worthies have not been distinguished for hereditary Rank, though, in many instances, the foundations of Greatness have been laid within her walls. Nor has it often fallen to the lot of her youth to fight the battles of her Country, though, when occasion has offered, they have shewn themselves not deficient in patriotism and Velour. But wherever the higher walks of Commerce invite the British Merchant to honourable enterprise, her sons are to be seen the foremost in

pursuits to which the British Empire is indebted for it's Opulence and Grandeur. The Healing Art recognizes some of them among her ablest and most successful Practitioners. Law, the guardian of the Constitution, and the preserver of every man's reasonable Rights and Liberties, welcomes in them the most upright and assiduous of her Administrators. But, above all, does the Church rely on the fidelity of such of them as have devoted themselves to the service of her Altars; no inconsiderable portion of the Officiating Clergy of the Metropolis having been educated under the modest dome of Merchant Taylors'." [1] All of which associates the school very clearly with what we have called the transitional class.

The same character is seen in the most ancient foundation of all. The Headmaster of Winchester, Moberly, giving evidence before the Public Schools Commission, described his boys as "sons of the clergy, a large proportion, and professional men; not local professional men, but professional men at a distance. Some few are the sons of country gentlemen, but not so many. A certain class of our boys therefore is hardly of the same rank as some who go to Eton or Harrow. The line in life they have before them is not so varied as it is with the boys in those schools. A certain proportion I [illegible] to go to the University; some of them become professional men, I mean solicitors, surgeons, etc. A certain number go to the bar, and many become clergymen. A few go to the army, or the navy, or other professions, but we have not any great number going into those lines of life. I think we should go past our peculiarity, if we laid ourselves out for other purposes". [2]

---

1 Quoted in Carlisle, vol. ii, p. 67
2 P.S.C. Evidence, vol. iii. p.953

To this must be added that the total annual expenses of a Commoner in the Headmaster's house were estimated at £115,[1] which put a lower economic limit to the class having access to Winchester, at least outside College. We are told also that the Scholars were probably no poorer than the Commoners.[2]

We have seen that about a third of the boys at Shrewsbury were foundationers, which meant sons of burgesses of the town. Samuel Butler had made the school famous for scholarship; learning enjoyed, perhaps, a greater prestige there than at other schools, and this would have diminished the importance attached to other kinds of distinction. A list of schools whose pupils won prizes at Cambridge between 1806 and 1814 shows that Shrewsbury, which obtained 10 in the period, was exceeded only by Bury with 11, while Eton and Charterhouse had 8 each, and no other great school more than 3.[3] It must be borne in mind that both Shrewsbury and Bury sent their pupils preponderantly to Cambridge, while many others had closer connections with Oxford; and that too many of the Etonians at Cambridge vegetated at King's, mentally numbed by the privileges which exempted them from the strain of examinations. Nevertheless, the point that two smallish schools having few aristocratic connections should have reached such intellectual eminence is important. It could not fail to have a considerable effect on their reputation in an age which accorded increasing social recognition to learning and to men who lived by their learning.

At Rugby the foundation was no longer serving Sheriff's purpose.[4]

---

1 P.S.C. Report, vol. i, p.154
2 P.S.C. Evidence, vol. iii, q. 1025
3 Carlisle, op.cit. vol. ii, p. 392
4 P.S.C. Report, Vol. i, pp. 267-71

It was stated to the Public Schools Commission that any tradesman of Rugby could send his son to the school,[1] but there is very little evidence that this was done in fact. Of the boys entering the school during 1841, 8 were resident in Rugby; of these 4 had fathers bearing military titles, one was the son of a clergyman, one the son and one the nephew of G. Blandford Esq., and one the nephew of Mrs. Bass. The "Esq" would not be accorded to a tradesman, and the presence of two nephews, as well as of so many military fathers, suggests a small drift of the respectable classes to the town to take advantage of the foundation.[2] An analysis [3] of all the entrants in that year, the last full year under Arnold, shows a fair number of upper class boys and a great number that we can only ascribe to the transitional class. The Rugby School Register gives little about the parents except their titles and addresses. On that basis we can conclude that out of a total of 123, sons of peers, baronets, knights, army officers (or at least the wearers of military titles), obvious landowners and one son of the Lord Chief Justice of Ireland amount to 40. Boys from the fashionable parts of London, 10; from other parts of London and from the large provincial towns, 14; sons of clergy, 17 and most of the rest are from quiet, respectable places like Oxford, Cheltenham, and Canterbury. This sort of classification is very rough, but it suggests that Rugby may have been about equally divided between the upper and the transitional classes.

Harrow was distinctly upper class in composition throughout the period. The Commissioners were told that most of the boys belonged to the landed aristocracy, many to the professional classes, and a few were sons of clergy.[4] As at Rugby the foundation was no

1. P.S.C. Evidence, Vol. iv, p. 381.
2. See Rugby School Register, vol. i, pp. 220-9
3. Ibid
4. P.S.C. Evidence, Vol. iv, p. 183.

longer what had originally been intended. It was believed that there was no longer any tradesman's son at the school. Foundationers were often the sons of widows who came to live at Harrow with this object. There were even home boarders - day boys - who did not take advantage of the foundation, though they had a right to. The total number of home boarders was 32.[1] The foundationers were mixed with the others in the school, but the authorities were determined to keep the boarder element predominant.

An analysis of the Harrow School Register bears out this evidence.[2] In the year of the Commission's report, 1864, 157 boys entered the school. Judging them in the same way as we did at Rugby, it can be said that 88 belonged unequivocally to the upper class. Sons of clergy were 18; from the fashionable parts of London, 16; other parts of London and the big provincial towns, 9; small fashionable towns, 2; colonial, 4; sons of Indian Civil Servants, 6; residents of Harrow (of all classes), 8; and 6 doubtful cases. This establishes a great preponderance of the upper classes at Harrow.

This preponderance is equally marked at Westminster and more so at Eton, but in these cases the Registers do not easily admit of analysis.[3] The foundation at Westminster was meant for poor boys, but that condition, the Commissioners were told, was never considered.[4] The Queen's Scholars (who, as we saw, were selected for academic distinction) were looked up to by the school, which they would not have been if they had been poor boys.[5] The expenses of a Queen's

1. P.S.C. Evidence, Vol iv, pp. 158-9
2. Harrow School Register, pp. 369-81
3. The Record of Old Westminsters is arranged in alphabetical order, not by years; and the information in the Eton School Lists is scanty. It may be added that the Shrewsbury School Register omits information about parents.
4. P.S.C. Evidence, Vol. iii, p. 416.
5. Ibid., vol, iii, p. 440.

Scholar were from £34 to £35 per annum, and those of a Town Boy £94. 10. 0d. There was, at Westminster, a special class of Town boys, the Home Boarders (not on the foundation, as those at Harrow were); they paid £26. 16. 0d.

Eton was the most aristocratic of all. The School Lists seldom give any information about parentage, and for many boys give no facts of any kind. But out of 346 oppidans in the Upper School in the list for 1817, 204 were clearly connected with the upper class in later life by being landowners, relations of landowners, or officers in the army. About most of the rest the information is defective, so very few can be said with any certainty not to have belonged to the landowning class.[1]

We conclude with a glance at Christ's Hospital, the free and wealthy charity that produced such ornaments of society as Charles Lamb, S. T. Coleridge and Leigh Hunt. The writings of these men[2] make it clear that Christ's Hospital, whatever the original intention, was not essentially a parish charity for labourers' sons. Rather it was "one receptacle, where parents of rather more liberal views, but whose time-straitened circumstances do not admit of affording their children that better sort of education which they themselves, not without cost to their parents, have received, may without cost send their sons..... It is, in a word, an institution to keep those who have yet held up their heads in the world from sinking; to keep alive the spirit of a decent household, when poverty was in danger of crushing it!"[3] Under these circumstances it is not surprising to find the sons of clergy very numerous in the school. But "the sons

---

1. Eton School Lists, pp. 88-96
2. Those relevant have been collected by R. Brimley Johnson under the title Christ's Hospital, etc., (see Bibliography)
3. Ibid. pp. 8-9.

of poor gentry and London citizens abound; and with them an equal share is given to the sons of tradesmen of the very humblest description, not omitting servants!"[1]

The question suggested by this mixture is answered as we might expect; if a boy "learns to read tolerably well before nine, he is drafted into the Lower Grammar School, if not, into the Writing School, as having given proof of unfitness for classical studies". There was a further draft into the Writing School (which prepared for commerce) of the failures from the Grammer School. There was also a Mathematical School, which trained a special class of Scholars for the Navy. It cannot be said of Christ's Hospital that it provided a golden road from poverty to social eminence; but the importance attached to rescuing respectable families from the consequences of their poverty, and the method of doing so - a classical schooling, and a way to the University, for those who could take advantage of it - throw a valuable light on the kind of degradation which decayed gentlefolk feared.

The most significant of all reasons for the development of a particular social character at each public school was what may be called the necessity for compatibility or congeniality among boys thrown together into such close contact. A boy of middle class origi and a good preparatory education could adapt himself to the habits and outlook of the community into which he was thrown. After a long sojourn in it (we shall see in the next chapter how this happened) he had been completely assimilated (one might almost say gleichgeschalte but without tears). He emerged from the school as a person indistinguishable from his fellows of higher birth. But the awkward unadaptable middle class boy, and the poor boy, found themselves the

1. Ibid., p. 135.

butt of such ridicule and hostility as to make their position unbearable, and their parents withdrew them. This is how the original class of foundationers was squeezed out of Harrow.[1] Winchester had, in the last two or three years before the Commission, admitted "boys of rather low parentage", to give them a chance of benefiting from the founder's largesse. But the experiment had not turned out as well as was hoped.[2]

Secondly, there was a selection of an academic kind. When Winchester in 1854 opened her scholarships to competitive examination, the fear was expressed that boys of bad character or connections would gain entrance, but the fear had proved to be unjustified. The education necessary for candidates was never received in "ill-conducted families" [3] At Rugby it was said that sons of tradesmen were sometimes entered, but that owing to their faulty preliminary education they seldom rose into the upper school. Most significantly, when they did, there were no differences or distinctions between them and the other boys.[4]

We can sum up the position by saying that in most of the great public schools the transitional class provided the greater number of the pupils, and the upper class a smaller but in some cases almost equal number; while in two or three the upper class was predominant and the transitional class in second place. These two classes were thus, in varying proportions, to be found together in most of the great schools. Boys from lower classes were admitted, but their continuance and success at the school depended on their ability to adapt themselves to the prevailing atmosphere, and that in

---

1. F.E. Thornton, Harrow School and its Surroundings, pp. 223-6 and passim
2. P.S.C. Evidence, Vol. iii, p. 338
3. P.S.C. Evidence, Vol. iii, p. 338; Report, Vol.i.pp.137, 140
4. P.S.C. Evidence, Vol.iv, Q. 1508 - 11

turn depended largely on their previous education.

Does this mean that in most of the schools it was the transitional class that set the standard, and the upper class that underwent the assimilation? If this had meant any departure from the cultural and moral traditions of the upper class, they would certainly not have sent their sons to such schools. We shall see that the influence exerted was largely at the instance of the masters, and it would thus be truer to say that they (representatives of an academic and ecclesiastical world revered by all classes) welded into a single type of their own creation the material provided by two classes of boys, culturally not very dissimilar.

We are now in a position to examine the educational distribution of social classes statistically. Turning our attention back to the six parliaments which were analysed on a social basis, let us see how they looked from the educational point of view. This is the result:

TABLE C.

School.	1818	1820	1826	1857	1859	1865
Winchester	7	5	8	10	13	11
Eton	93	95	98	115	129	132
Westminster	77	80	67	26	28	27
Harrow	21	29	45	63	58	57
Rugby	9	7	9	20	21	19
Shrewsbury	1	1	1	4	5	9
Charterhouse	3	2	2	4	4	5
Merchant Taylors'	1	-	-	-	-	1
St. Paul's	0	1	1	-	-	-
Other English Schools	17	15	13	26	33	21
Scotland, Ireland & Abroad.	5	4	4	3	3	10
Military, Naval and East Indian Colleges	3	3	3	8	3	2
Privately(see below)	14	23	16	14	14	21
No reference (see below)	111	108	101	60	52	43
Unknown	146	139	142	143	131	142
TOTAL	508	512	510	496	494	500
Vacant Seats	5	1	3	-	2	-
Total Seats	513	513	513	496	496	500

TABLE D.

EDUCATED AT THE NINE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

Parliament.	Number.	Percentage of Total Members.
1818	212	41.7
1820	220	43.0
1826	231	45.3
1857	242	48.8
1859	258	52.0
1865	261	52.2

This result is clear enough. While the proportion of the landed class in Parliament was falling, the proportion of alumni of the nine great schools was steadily rising. It is curious that the least increase should be in the long period between 1826 and 1857, but that is explained by the sharp decline in the numbers from Westminster which had suffered an eclipse from about the time of Goodenough (1819-28). [1] It will be understood that the relative prosperity of the schools would show itself in the parliamentary analysis only after a considerable time-lag, even in those days when the nation was so largely - poetically speaking - entrusted to "schoolboys' care."

We remark the great increase in numbers from Harrow and, proportionately, from Rugby. Even the rise of Shrewsbury and Charterhouse may be significant in an age when the transitional class was more prominent in Parliament. And standing clearly out above the rest is Eton, with two and a half times the figure of its nearest rival

1 See W.L.C., The Public Schools, pp. 137-8

at the end.

It is impossible to draw any valid conclusions from these figures till we have explained the large and puzzling groups lower in the columns. As in our social analysis, so here we are unable to satisfy every enquiry. The sources of information for compiling this part of the card-index were:

Winchester College ; a Register (1836-1906).

Eton School Lists (1791-1877).

Record of Old Westminsters.

Harrow School Register (1800-1911).

Rugby School Register (1675-1874).

Shrewsbury School Register, Vol.I,(1798-1908).

Cheltenham College Register (1841-1910).

Radley Register (1847-1925).

All the sources used for the social analysis (see p.59).

Of these, only the Westminster and Rugby records go back far enough to approach completion in relation to our period. Some others, such as Merchant Taylors', have lists which begin too late for our purpose.[1] The Winchester list could not be used for the first three Parliaments, and was inadequate for the last three. Those of Eton, Harrow and Shrewsbury were more or less complete for the later Parliaments, and covered the generation to which most of the members of the earlier three belonged. The registers of the schools outside the nine yielded no results.

The gaps were very largely filled by the sources used in the social analysis. But here a difficulty presented itself. In a great number of cases, where there was no shortage of information about

---

1 W.Baker, Merchant Taylors' School Register, 1871-1900.

the subject (such as lengthy obituary notices in the Gentleman's Magazine and the Annual Register) there was either no reference at all to his education or else a reference to his university education only - such as "educated at Christ Church, Oxford". These cases have been tabulated separately under the heading "No Reference". What conclusion can be drawn from the silence? No certain conclusion, but to say that very many of these people must have received their schooling at home would be a safe guess. In a few cases, often those of socially eminent men like heirs to peerages, we are explicitly told that they were educated by private tutors at home. It is likely that this fact would not be thought worth mentioning in most biographical notes. Hence "educated at Christ Church, Oxford." A similar difficulty arises in the case of the man who was "brought up to trade" or "entered his father's business at an early age" or was "apprenticed to a printer" etc. etc. Then there were the boys who entered the navy at fourteen, twelve or even younger (that seems to have been the usual thing in a naval career) and in a few cases boys of a similar age began life in the army. All these, together with those who are stated to have had all their schooling at home, are placed under the rubric "Privately" In the "No Reference" cases will almost certainly be found the greater number of those who were taught at home, but it would serve no purpose to guess the proportion.

Where the information available in a case is scanty (as entries in Burke, or the shorter notices in the Gentleman's Magazine and the Annual Register) and there has been no reference to education, it has been classed as Unknown. We cannot say for certain that none of these or of the previous category was at ..

a public school, but they are at least excluded from the schools about which we have full information - Westminster and Rugby all through and for the later parliaments also Eton, Harrow and Shrewsbury There cannot have been many from these schools even in the earlier parliaments who escaped notice, as most of their members were young enough to be covered by the period of these records. The consistency of the figures, and their correspondence with what we might have expected from our other knowledge of the schools, make it unlikely that the figures for the public schools contain any significant error.

As a final check, it is necessary to correlate the educational with the social analysis, which means to make a social analysis of the figures for each school, and an educational analysis of the figures for each class. They are contained in the tables which follow:

TABLE E. 1818.

School.	Total.	Landowning.	Transitional.	Other	Unknown.
Winchester	7	4	2	1	-
Eton	93	87(4)	3	1	2
Westminster	77	73	4	-	-
Harrow	21	20	1	-	-
Rugby	9	7	1	1(1)	-
Shrewsbury	1	1	-	-	-
Charterhouse	3	3	-	-	-
Merchant Taylors'	1	-	-	1	-
St. Paul's	-	-	-	-	-
Other English Schools.	17	9	1	7	-
Scotland, Ireland and abroad.	5	2	2	1	-
Military, Naval and E.Indian Colleges.	3	3	-	-	-
Privately.	14	10	3	1	-
No reference.	111	100	5	6(2)	-
Unknown	146	58(8)	5(3)	4(1)	79
TOTAL	508	377(12)	27(3)	23(4)	81

TABLE F. 1820.

School.	Total.	Landowning.	Transitional.	Other	Unknown.
Winchester	6	3	1	1	-
Eton	95	89(2)	3	1	2
Westminster	80	75	5	-	-
Harrow	29	27	2(1)	-	-
Rugby	7	5	1	1	-
Shrewsbury	1	1	-	-	-
Charterhouse	2	2	-	-	-
Merchant Taylors'	-	-	-	-	-
St. Paul's	1	1	-	-	-
Other English Schools.	15	8	2	5	-
Scotland, Ireland and abroad.	4	2	2	-	-
Military, Naval and E.Indian Colleges.	3	3	-	-	-
Privately	23	17(1)	1	5(1)	-
No Reference	108	97	4	5(1)	2
Unknown	139	48(6)	5(2)	3(3)	83
Total	512	378(9)	26(5)	21(5)	87

TABLE G. 1826.

School.	Total.	Landowning.	Transitional.	Other.	Unknown.
Winchester	8	6	2	-	-
Eton	98	91(4)	4	-	3
Westminster	67	62	4	1	-
Harrow	45	42(1)	2(1)	-	1
Rugby	9	9	-	-	-
Shrewsbury	1	1	-	-	-
Charterhouse	2	2	-	-	-
Merchant Taylors'	-	-	-	-	-
St. Paul's	1	1	-	-	-
Other English Schools	13	3	4	6	-
Scotland, Ireland and abroad.	4	2	2	-	-
Military, Naval and E.Indian Colleges.	3	3	-	-	-
Privately	16	10	1	5(2)	-
No Reference	101	90(1)	3(1)	7(2)	1
Unknown	142	57(6)	4	4(2)	77
Total	510	379(12)	26(2)	23(6)	82

TABLE H. 1857.

School	Total	Land-owning	Trans-itional	Other	Unknown.
Winchester	10	8	2	-	-
Eton	115	107 (1)	2 (1)	-	6
Westminster	26	25	1	-	-
Harrow	63	59	3 (3)	-	1
Rugby	20	17 (1)	1 (1)	1(1)	1
Shrewsbury	4	1	2	-	1
Charterhouse	4	2	2	-	-
Merchant Taylors'	-	-	-	-	-
St. Paul's	-	-	-	-	-
Other english Schools	26	6	5	13(2)	2
Scotland, Ireland and abroad	3	-	2	1	-
Military, Naval and East Indian Colleges	8	5	1	2(1)	-
Privately	14	6	2	6	-
No Reference	60	45	6	9(1)	-
Unknown	143	55(1)	6	2(2)	80
Total	486	336(3)	35(5)	34(7)	91

TABLE I. 1859.

School	Total	Land-owning	Trans-itional	Other	Unknown
Winchester	13	10	3	-	-
Eton	129	121(1)	2(1)	-	6
Westminster	28	27	1	-	-
Harrow	58	55(1)	2(2)	-	1
Rugby	21	21(1)	-	-	-
Shrewsbury	5	3	1	-	1
Charterhouse	4	2	2	-	-
Merchant Taylors'	-	-	-	-	-
St. Paul's	-	-	-	-	-
Other English Schools	33	8	5	18(2)	2
Scotland, Ireland and abroad	3	1	2	-	-
Military, Naval and East Indian Colleges	3	2	-	1(1)	-
Privately	14	7	2	5(1)	-
No Reference	52	41	7	4	-
Unknown	131	52(1)	6	2(2)	72
Total	494	350(4)	32(3)	30(6)	82

TABLE J. 1865.

School	Total	Land-owning	Trans-itional	Other	Unknown
Winchester	11	7	4	-	-
Eton	132	128(1)	3	-	1
Westminster	27	25	2	-	-
Harrow	57	53	3(3)	-	1
Rugby	19	16	2	-	1
Shrewsbury	9	3	2	1	3
Charterhouse	5	4	1	-	-
Merchant Taylors'	1	-	-	1	-
St. Paul's	-	-	-	-	-
Other English Schools	21	7	4	9(1)	1
Scotland, Ireland and abroad	10	3	4	3	-
Military, Naval and East Indian Colleges	2	1	1	-	-
Privately	21	8	5	8(1)	-
No Reference	43	33	6	4(1)	-
Unknown	142	53	5	5(5)	79
Total	500	341(1)	42(3)	31(6)	86

This further analysis, which shows the distribution of each school-group in classes and of each class in schools, throws new light on several aspects of our problem. It shows that the increase in public school elements in Parliament was contributed chiefly (almost entirely) by the upper, not the transitional class, in spite of the large numbers of the latter that attended the schools. This appearance is, however, deceptive, in that we have counted the sons of all landowners as belonging to the landowning class, though in many cases their fathers were squires of very short standing, whose riding habits had hardly shaken off the smoke and grime of the mill. Many in this class were therefore but one remove from the transitional group to which the Public Schools offered new social opportunities.

It is nevertheless important to note that the upper class had been sending its sons increasingly to Public Schools. The increase in the Public School group was chiefly at the expense of the "No Reference", and therefore probably of the privately educated class A diversion of favour from the manorial schoolroom and hired tutor to the Public School was a part of the change in upper class fashion in the period. It was this that made that kind of education more necessary for the middle class, and in doing so gave it the opportunity of contact and assimilation. The domestic schoolroom had by no means disappeared at the end of this period, and the large Victorian family was a good economic reason for bringing the school to the home. But the task of the tutor was increasingly confined to preparatory school work on the one hand and cramming for the University on the other.

Among Public Schools, the favour of the upper class was bestowed chiefly on Eton, Westminster and Harrow. The tide of

fashion had set strongly towards these before 1815, and was kept going in the same direction by the hereditary tendency. Even the falling off of numbers at Westminster did not affect its patrician character or damp the loyalty of Grosvenors, Pagets, Wynns and other great families that had been its props in the past. If the fame of Arnold, who ruled Rugby from 1828 to 1842, drew a fair number of aristocratic boys in that direction, they showed little tendency to favour any other school outside the distinguished group of three. The members of Parliament schooled at Winchester, Shrewsbury and Charterhouse were a noticably less patrician group.

The members classed as "transitional" and "other" are not numerous enough to be treated as representative of their classes, and, as we have said, many who were a short remove from the transitional had passed into the landowning class. But it is not surprising to find members of the third class educated at other English (which is to say, small provincial grammar) schools, or privately (meaning often apprenticeship to a trade) or else in the unknown group, which may often mean in reality the same as the other two.

There is little reason to imagine any direct connection between Public School education and entry into Parliament. An Eton schooling was not in itself a passport to the political world, except in so far as a man of humble or middle class origin would acquire from Eton the graces which were indispensable for moving comfortably in the patrician world of politics. The passport into politics bore the two stamps <u>wealth</u> and <u>leisure</u>, and the preponderance of Etonians, Westminsters and Harrovians in Parliament was due merely to their preponderence in the leisured class as a whole. The relatively small numbers of Rykehamists, Carthusians, Salopians and

boys from the great day schools can be similarly explained. The products of those schools were not, as a rule, free of the necessity of constant attendance to business or a profession.

An interesting light is thrown on this distribution by the educational classification of parties and cabinets. We take the same division lists and the same cabinets as were analysed socially on pp 64-6. The division lists give the following result:

TABLE K

School	1819		1827		1858		1866	
	Noes (Tory)	ayes (Whig)	Noes (Tory)	Ayes (Whig)	Ayes (Lib)	Noes (Cons)	Ayes (Lib)	Noes (Cons
Winchester	2	2	2	6	5	6	4	6
Eton	45	38	42	49	41	42	51	63
Westminster	43	24	28	31	6	14	9	15
Harrow	13	5	20	20	23	15	24	24
Rugby	6	3	6	4	10	7	9	9
Shrewsbury	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	2
Charterhouse	2	0	0	2	3	1	1	2
Merchant Taylors	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
St. Paul's	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Other English Schools	11	5	6	7	15	1	17	6
Scotland Ireland and abroad	3	2	0	4	2	0	2	1
Military Naval and East India Colleges	3	0	2	0	4	0	2	0
Privately	12	3	6	6	6	2	6	5
No Reference	54	34	47	40	28	14	22	18
Unknown	88	41	81	43	64	52	64	59
Total	283	157	240	212	210	154	217	210

The meaning of these figures can be better appreciated if we reduce them to a simple comparison between the Public School group and, on the other hand, the last three classes, Privately, No Reference and Unknown. This last composite group will include a large proportion of men educated privately and a large number of obscure nonentities.

TABLE 4.

		Public School	Privately etc.
1819	Tories	112	154
	Whigs	72	78
1827	Tories	98	133
	Whigs	112	89
1858	Conservatives	85	68
	Liberals	91	98
1866	Conservatives	121	82
	Liberals	104	92

There appears in these figures a contrast between the earlier and the later period analogous to the contrast we found in the social analysis of the same lists. In the earlier Parliaments there was a relatively much stronger Public School group among the Whigs than among the Tories, and in education, as in birth, a larger unknown and obscure group among the latter. We formerly explained this as partly due to the Tory control of rotten boroughs. But as education in the domestic schoolroom was common in the upper class, and as that class dominated both sides of the House, one is forced to the conclusion that a Public School education at the beginning of the century was relatively favourable to the growth of a broad outlook and novel ideas. Taking the upper class as a whole, the odds

were slightly on Tory opinions for a boy schooled at home, on Whig opinions for the Public School boy.

In the later period these probabilities have been reversed. By 1866 there is a stronger Public School body on both sides, but its predominance is more marked among the Conservatives. In 1868 the distribution of these groups within the parties is actually the reverse of the distribution in 1827. This fact is easily appreciated when coupled with two others: first, the increasing popularity of the Public Schools in the upper class, and secondly the concentration of that class in the Conservative party. And we noted before the increase of the obscure element on the Liberal side.

The cabinets were not, of course, representative cross-sections of their parties, of Parliament or the governing class. But it is interesting to note the strength of the Public School group in them. Here is the nominal roll of the ministries we considered in the earlier context:

1818 (Tory)

Winchester:	Sidmouth, C. B. Bathurst.
Eton:	Mulgrave, Canning, Polo.
Harrow:	Robinson.
Charterhouse:	Liverpool, Westmoreland.
Other English:	Eldon, Vansittart.
Scotland & Ireland:	Melville, Castlereagh.
No Reference:	Harrowby, Earl Bathurst.

1830 (Whig)

Eton:	Grey, Durham, Melbourne, Holland, Carlisle.
Westminster:	Lansdowne, Graham, Richmond.
Harrow:	Althorp, Palmerston, Goderich (Robinson in 1818)

Scotland & Abroad: Brougham, Grant.

1855 (Approx. Liberal):

Winchester:	Cranworth.
Eton:	Granville, Gladstone, Wood, Canning.
Westminster:	Graham, Lansdowne.
Harrow:	Palmerston, Herbert.
Charterhouse:	Panmure.
Abroad:	Molesworth.
Privately:	Argyll, Grey.
No Reference:	Clarendon.

1866 (Conservative):

Eton:	Derby, Buckingham, Malmesbury, Walpole, Carnarvon, Pakington, Northcote, Cranbourne, Manners, Hardy.
Rugby:	Stanley, Peel.
Other English:	Disraeli.
Privately and in Navy:	Naas, Chelmsford.

This analysis presents several very striking features. Schools other than the Public Schools hardly come into the picture. In the purely landowning cabinet of Lord Grey the only Public Schools represented are Eton, Westminster and Harrow, and these account for 11 out of 13 ministers. The Derby-Disraeli ministry, in the days when Public School, upper class and Conservative Party were becoming more closely identified, is still more remarkable: 10 Etonians out of 15 members. The privately educated and No Reference classes, where they appear at all, are distinctly aristocratic. In 1855 they comprised the Duke of Argyll (son-in-law to the Queen), Sir George Grey and Lord Clarendon. The implication is that a Public School education gave the best chance

of success in politics. Without it, the politician would not reach the front benches unless he belonged to, or were closely connected with, the higher ranks of the peerage.

The change in the character of the parties is illustrated also. In the earlier period it is the Whig cabinet that is conspicuously drawn from the more aristocratic schools; in the later period the Conservative. This change coincides with, and is largely explained by, the tendency for the upper class to congregate in the Conservative party. We may guess without great probability of error that the non-Public School elements contained a far smaller proportion of domestic tutor products in the later period than in the earlier, and a larger number of self-made and almost self-educated men of humble origin.

The process that has been revealed so far can be described as a closely interrelated series of changes in the social, economic, political and educational fields. The upper class in society had consisted almost exclusively of landowners and their relations. The governing class that sat in Parliament and controlled all the political machinery was likewise identical with the landowning group. Both these facts are explained by the monopoly of leisure enjoyed by that class, and the necessity of leisure as a qualification for either social eminence or a political career. Changes in the economic system opened industrial and commercial avenues to leisure. The upper class and the governing class both broadened their economic basis so as to include men with leisure but without land. The Public Schools provided an education suited to the purpose of a leisure class, and became thereby the means of assimilating the new men of leisure to the old.

It is clear that the economic change was the fundamental one from which the others followed. But it remains to assign some order of precedence to the others, and to form a preliminary opinion of the effect which these changes would be likely to have on the educational system and its assimilative function in the future.

At first sight it might seem that the political change underlay the social. Members of Parliament were necessarily leisured since they had to devote their time to unpaid service. Is it not likely that the increasing social recognition of the new leisure class was the consequence of its increasing participation in political power? Power is of course always treated with some respect, but several considerations induce us to rule out this interpretation. The extension of the franchise and of actual participation in Parliament, in later times, to all classes did not bring with it many invitations to the dinner-parties of Mayfair. And within our own period individual members of Parliament, such as George Hudson, who were not fully qualified in leisure were still excluded from Society. It is therefore true to say that education in leisure was in itself the chief requirement for social recognition and that it was the desire to keep the vulgar herd out of politics, as far as possible, that caused the rejection of the Chartists' demand for payment of members until 1911.

The system of education that helped to smooth over this social transition had been devised long before the Industrial Revolution. Was there any likelihood that the changes produced by that Revolution would in time affect the educational system so as to alter its usefulness as a bridge between two leisured classes? In the next chapter we shall examine the actual effects of the

Industrial Revolution upon leisure class education, but it is desirable to make, in anticipation, a guess based on the social, political and economic changes with which we are already familiar. We have seen that landowners played an increasing part in industry both as shareholders and directors, and that membership of the upper class was increasingly compatible with a practical interest in business. The upper class as a whole became steadily more familiar with economics, the stock market, applied science and the marvels of nineteenth century inventiveness. At the same time the development of pure scientific knowledge - in chemistry, electricity and geology for instance - made its impact upon the minds of scholars. It might seem likely that these influences would be reflected in the common opinion of what should constitute a gentleman's education. But if this education were subjected to such influences it would at the same time become increasingly useful to people who needed education to prepare them for gainful occupations. It would cease to be an education for leisure only.

Political changes pointed in the same direction. The extension of the franchise in 1832 was followed by increasing parliamentary attention to middle class interests; factory condition railways, banking, company law. Classical oratory now took second place to acquaintance with the dismal science in the politician's repertoire. In debates on these ever-recurring subjects classical scholars might be made to look foolish by upstarts of the Manchester School. In Parliament, as in everyday life, the upper class might find Latin and Greek inadequate. But in so far as they watered down the traditional curriculum with an admixture of "useful" subjects, they would be obliterating the educational distinction

between classes.

We have now to ask, what were the features of public school life that enabled those schools to weld their diverse human elements into one? What part did the classical curriculum play in that work? And how were that curriculum and the character of the educational system affected by the great changes in society and politics?

CHAPTER V.

THE PUBLIC SCHOOL AS A SOCIAL CRUCIBLE.

A public school was, in spite of the exceptions, essentially a boarding-school. The intimate companionship of the boarding-school did not leave much room for the assertion of individuality. Boys are, in mental development, barbarians, and like our ancestors in the tribal stage are intolerant of individuals who do not conform to the general type. Ridicule is the mildest weapon used against them. Torture is not excluded, and where these means are unsuccessful the kindest policy for parents is to withdraw their child from the uncongenial environment. Schoolboys have adapted the principles of James I: "we will make him conform or we will harry him out of the school."

In the days before the Methodists, the Evangelicals and Dr. Arnold, when schoolmasters frankly admitted that their job was to teach Latin and Greek, but not morality, [1] this enforcement of conformity was largely at the expense of morals and the good breeding of those boys who had it. Arnold, even before he went to Rugby, had made up his mind that every boy whose character and example did not exercise a positively good influence on the rest of the school would have a bad one. He made it a condition of his accepting the Headmastership that he should be free to expel any boy at his discretion, and announced his intention of doing so more often than had been done in the past. [2] This intention was carried out.

---

1 W.L.C., The Public Schools, p.319.

2 J.J.Findlay (ed.), Arnold of Rugby, pp. 14, 29.

Every year at Rugby Arnold saw a new generation of boys enter the school, coming, largely, from good homes where they "not only heard of what was good, but, on the whole, practised it," [1] and then within a short time adapt themselves to the ways prevailing among their fellows. The Headmaster, preaching to them, explained that "you all find that you would be afraid to speak and act just as you ought to do, because you would be laughed at and disliked if you did." [2] Daily observation convinced him that unless some very strong force counteracted it, the influence of the worst characters in the school would prevail in setting standards that would be accepted unquestioningly by the others. Any who rebelled against this stern rule of public opinion would be "laughed at and disliked". Arnold therefore attacked this tyranny in process of formation. He kept a close watch on the friendships formed among his pupils, and regarded the groups of vicious boys that he sometimes saw gathered together [3] as the source of most of the evil elements in the public opinion of the school. These vicious "companionships" were frequently attacked in his sermons.

Arnold observed not merely the symptom, but also its cause, which he found in the tradition of antagonism between masters and boys. This, too, was attacked in sermons. [4] The boys, drawn together by the feeling that they were facing a common enemy, were thereby subjected the more to the tyranny of their own community. They "have learnt to regard themselves and their masters as opposites to one ,

---

1 Ibid., p.124.
2 Ibid., p.125.
3 Ibid., p.62.
4 Ibid., p.179.

another, as having two distinct interests; - it being the master's object to lay on restrictions, and abridge their liberty, while it was their business, by all sorts of means, - combination amongst themselves, concealment, trick, open falsehood or open disobedience, - to baffle his watchfulness, and escape his severity." [1] No wonder, then, that a boy should feel that "the favour or displeasure of his masters, cannot affect his comfort nearly so much as the liking or disliking of his companions." [2] Arnold, in a profound observation, shows the consequences of this in the wider world of men: "the servility which exists in England, whether among men or boys, is not an excessive deference for legal authority, but a surrender of individual judgment and conscience to the tyranny of public opinion. This tyranny exists in schools to a fatal degree." [3]

But it did not necessarily promote vice; it might also be a benevolent despotism. Thus Sir Owen Seaman, who was head scholar of Shrewsbury, shortly after leaving that school wrote of the discipline maintained there by public opinion: "Anything approaching 'swagger' is severely rebuked; there is no more objectionable quality than that understood by the expression 'He's got such a horrid roll on.'

Criticism is severe on this point at Shrewsbury; and one must be careful not to swing the arm too far, or take too long a stride. Anything like meanness or want of school patriotism will make a boy disliked. There is thorough union in the school in cases where patriotic

---

1 Ibid., p.131.
2 Ibid., p.143.
3 Ibid., p.234, and cf. letter, pp. 111-2.

spirit is called for." [1]

That uniformity in speech would be produced by the conditions of public school life goes almost without saying. That this uniformity was the result of, and did not necessarily precede, the common education is suggested by observation at the present day. Each of the greater public schools, far from inculcating the same general upper class form of speech, has developed a distinct though slight variant of it, so that the products of each school, when they are still newly fledged, can be distinguished by an acute ear.[2] This view is borne out by the fact that every school had a peculiar slang which formed a more or less important part of the speech of its members, and new boys were compelled to acquire this with the utmost alacrity. Winchester possessed the most remarkable example of such a slang in its "notions."[3] The social consequences of this uniformity in speech were supremely important. Since speech is one of the most obvious of class shibboleths, an educated accent makes it easier for a man not born into the governing class to move in it without feeling uncomfortable or self-conscious. At the same time it must be observed that the effect of the public school on speech would depend on some pre-existing uniformity within the upper class. In the days when that class brought its provincial dialects to London or to Harrow there would be no ground on which one boy's speech could be ridiculed. We have seen that in the 'forties and 'fifties there was no doubt about the uniformity of upper class speech.[4] It can therefore be assumed that this kind of assimilation operated in

1 C.E.Pascoe (ed.), op.cit., pp. 165-6.

2 The writer's observation at Oxford.

3 See H.C. Adams, Wykehamica, pp. 414-39.

4 See above, p. 22.

our period.

In speaking of assimilation and of the force of public opinion we have implied that the whole school was a single community. But this was not usually true. Most schools preserved a formal distinction between the foundationerson the one hand - scholars, Collegers, gown-boys - and, on the other, the commoners, town boys or oppidans who paid the whole of their expenses. The former usually wore gowns and lived "in College," that is to say in the quarters provided originally by the founder. Where the foundation was really used to benefit boys of decayed fortunes (though often gentle birth) the distinction between the two classes was an economic one which boys could not be expected to overlook. During the greater part of our period the Oppidans at Eton regarded the "Tugs" with unmitigated contempt, and this is to be explained only by the relative poverty of the latter. If relatively poor boys had been intermixed with the others, this situation could not have arisen; firstly because they could not have been there unless rich enough to partake of the ordinary occupations of their fellows, and secondly because the ostracism of an isolated individual on grounds of plutocratic snobbery alone would have been too blatantly mean. It was the existence of College with its separate life that made these unhappy relations possible. The Collegers as a whole being unable to indulge in much extravagance, they were excluded as a body from the expensive amusements of the river - and thereby branded with the stamp of social inferiority. In 1864 the first Colleger appeared in the Eight, but it was not till 1869 that the right of Collegers

generally to participate in that sport was recognised.[1]

In contrast to the sumptuous fare which Oppidans usually obtained, whether in their own houses or by their regular patronage of "sock" shops, the Collegers had to dine on mutton and potatoes for five days of the week, with other meals in proportion. Yet this factor did not cause distinctions among individual Oppidans. Though Eton attracted many of the sons of the rich, they did not set an expensive example that had to be followed. The necessary standard of expenditure was prescribed rather by the regular charges of the School and the Houses, and the expenses of sports and customary presents. A boy belonging to a "mess" whose standard of living was unnecessarily high might leave it for that reason and join one that fed more cheaply, without being despised for doing so.[2] The food of Oppidans was much simpler in the 'forties than later.[3] So was the accommodation - their rooms and furniture. The armchair, already very general in the 'sixties, was "almost unknown" two decades earlier.[4] Thus distinctions based on standards of comfort operated between Oppidans and Collegers as classes, but not among individuals.

Again, out of 70 Collegers, 16 were fag-masters, whereas in any Oppidan house the number of these would be very few. College had ten Sixth Form, and the other ten were divided

---

1 J.Brinsley-Richards, Seven Years at Eton, pp. 113-4; A.C.Ainger, Memories of Eton Sixty Years Ago, p.74

2 Gambier-Parry, Annals of an Eton House, pp. 82-3.

3 Ibid. p.60.

4 Ibid., pp. 82-3.

among 25 houses. Of the Fifth Form fag-masters a larger proportion were Oppidens. Thus fagging duties were relatively excessive in College.[1] Down to the 'forties, 52 Collegers slept in Long Chamber; even after the erection of New Buildings in 1846 that famous abode lodged 21 of them, whereas every Oppidan had a room to himself.[2]

All these facts constantly appeared to the Oppidens as evidence of their own superiority. One small Oppidan in 1858 was asked by his parents to "be civil to" a "freckled little boy of eleven" from Aberdeen who came to Eton to try for College. The host did his best, but: "I was mean enough to be ashamed of the fellow whenever I was seen with him; and this not because his voice was loudish, his manners rough, and his jacket of outlandish cut, but because he was going to be a 'tug'."[3] The King's Scholar who ventured into an Oppidan house was greeted with a shower of missiles; on a snowy day he walked, or ran, down a street as a target for snowballs. Any hope that he might be left to contemplate his inferiority behind the friendly shelter of anonymity was taken away by the obligation to wear his gown at all times.[4]

These discordant relations were no doubt invited by the division of the school into a rich and a poor class. Boys will always show ostentatious contempt for any person or class if they have an excuse to do so. The question for us is whether this phenomenon at Eton had any bearing upon the social position of Collegers

---

1 Ainger, op.cit., pp.19-21.
2 Ibid. p.17; Gambier-Parry, op.cit., p.8.
3 Brinsley-Richards, op.cit., pp. 112-3.
4 Ainger, op.cit., pp. 75-6; Brinsley-Richards, op.cit., p.115.

when they left school. No doubt the extent of this contemptuous attitude of the Oppidans has been exaggerated; of the writers we have quoted on the subject one admits that it had begun to wear away in the early 'sixties;[1] another points out that it was much less marked among the older boys: "there was a very marked contrast between the relations of Collegers and Oppidans in the lower parts of the school and those prevailing higher up." It was in the last two years of one's time at Eton that relations were so much better.[2]

This must have been due to the stronger influence of other kinds of class distinction at that stage. There was the Eton Society to which Collegers as well as Oppidans were admitted, roughly in proportion to their numbers in the school, to the number of twenty-eight in all. This was in origin and intent a debating society, but was notable chiefly for the lustre it conferred on its members.[3] Colleger and Oppidan mixed in it on terms of equality and friendship, their common distinction obliterating old differences. If the King's Scholar was for a long time kept out of the boats, there was no such distinction on the cricket field; in 1851 there were six Collegers in the Eleven.[4] To the natural and amorphous aristocracy of the "swells", which formed the highest rank among the senior boys, the King's Scholars were similarly eligible. Of the esteem in which the "swell" was held it is hardly necessary to speak. Of the one swell in a certain house of twenty-six boys (he was Captain of the boats and in the Sixth Form) we read: "He was a person apart,

---

1 Brinsley-Richards, op.cit., p.113.

2 Ainger, op.cit., pp. 76-7.

3 Ainger, op.cit., pp. 76-7, 291-3.

4 Ibid., p.150.

a sort of demi-god; he had, I believe, no intimate friend in the house; his companions were of a higher grade, and we small boys regarded him.....with unmixed awe and admiration. There were some daring spirits among the lower boys in the house who might conceivably 'cheek' my tutor, but not one, I am quite sure, would have had the hardihood to take such a liberty with this dignitary." [1] The Oppidan "swell" might find his friends in other houses, or even in College. In these higher strata of the school there was scope for intimate friendship between boys of the two classes, though it must be admitted that this opportunity was affected by the limiting circumstances we have described.

These conditions arose out of the methods of selection for College, which continued through our period to be a system of patronage. Thus Collegers did not yet enjoy any intellectual distinction, and they were commonly drawn from a lower social class than in later times.[2] Those who wanted to be Collegers in order to get to King's put off the ordeal (of Long Chamber) and the humiliation as long as possible, so that most of the Collegers were, in our period, members of the higher forms. [3] Taking these facts together, we can estimate that, with the exception of a very few cases, Collegers could have taken no mark of inferiority with them when they left school.

At Winchester there was none of this social distinction between scholars and commoners. Perhaps the fact that scholars were not as a rule poorer than their fellows is enough to account for this.[4]

1 John Murray, in Ainger, op.cit., pp. 44-5.

2 H.G.Lyttelton, in Ainger, op.cit., p.31.

3 Maxwell Lyte, History of Eton College, pp. 421-2

4 P.S.C. Evidence, Vol. iii, Q.1025.

There is also the fact that scholars were, while at school, better provided for in every material way than commoners - in accomodation, for instance,[1] and in playing fields.[2] Commoners, unlike the Eton Oppidans, were housed in quarters even less spacious and comfortable than College. We have seen that the King's Scholars at Westminster were looked up to, and that Harrow and Rugby had almost lost their foundationers of the original class.

These considerations have already brought out the importance of the factor stressed by Thring, Headmaster of Uppingham and Arnold's companion in fame as maker of public school education in the nineteenth century. For Thring very much depended on the architectural arrangements, the "machinery", the single bedroom and the large dormitory. "There is much virtue, or vice, in a wall. No words, no personal influence, no religion even, can do instead of the holy help of a wall, or overcome its evil, if evil. "[3] This discovery Thring made in his own schooldays at Eton, where the conditions of Long Chamber made a very effective impression on his mind. "Imagine how pleasant, how favourable to morality this compulsory companionship must be, when a state of things is produced in which it is not possible for a boy to escape from hearing, or seeing whatever the worst boy there dares say or do; not possible either to escape from the bullying of his most detested tyrants."[4]

The remedy for this, which was introduced into Uppingham, was the provision of a separate bedroom and study for each boy. Into this no stranger might enter without special permission.[5]

1. Adams, Wykehamica, pp. 129-32, 233-9 [illegible].
2. R.C.S.C. Evidence, Vol.iii, Q.1025.
3. G.R.Parkin, Life and Letters of Edward Thring, pp. 276-7.
4. Thring, Education and School, p. 136.
5. G.R.Parkin, op.cit., pp. 74-5.

Thus might each of Thring's pupils escape from the tyrannical sway of the mass over him; in such privacy he might develop in a different way from his neighbours. There was no intention, however, that this freedom should be used to promote other ideals than those of the Headmaster. The influence of boys was to be less; that of masters greater. At Uppingham each house was to be as much as possible like a home, where the house-master and his wife could know all their boys intimately, and have almost the influence of parents. This condition limited the numbers in a house, which Thring fixed at thirty.[1] "The management is more easy, for the boys are not numerous, and cannot shift the blame on others, or band together with them. There is no divided authority, and no doubtful jurisdiction. The boys, on their part, love their own house and uphold it. It has a character which they are jealous about." [2]

By this means it was hoped to overcome at Uppingham the same evils as Arnold complained of at Rugby. Thring too found among his boys a tradition that between them and their masters there was a state of war, in which all things were fair.[3] This he endeavoured to change, and with considerable success; of which scattered entries in his diary are evidence. For instance, "yesternight two boys came in to me to ask advice how to settle a bad boy in their house, and uphold morality and right. This is very cheering. They tell me today they think they can manage it"[4]

---

1 Ibid., I. p.71.
2 Thring, Education and School, pp. 174-5
3 Thring, op.cit., p.26; cf. pp. 141-2.
4 Parkin, op.cit., p.138.

Schools differed in respect of this "holy help of a wall." At Eton, privacy was accorded to Oppidans, and in the course of time to most of the Collegers as well; at Winchester that luxury was beyond the reach of any but one fortunate Prefect. This difference had of course (apart from important moral consequences) the result that the tyranny of public opinion was much more strongly felt in a school organised as Winchester was. In some ways Winchester suffered during an important period of its history from the evils of both systems. Constant supervision by Prefects was possible in large dormitories, but when the Commoners of Winchester were housed after 1838 in their new building, there were far more rooms than the Prefects could supervise, though not enough to give privacy to anyone: 12 Prefects (including one who had a room to himself) and 41 rooms. Matters had been slightly, but not much, better in Old Commoners.[1] After 1846 one of these disadvantages was removed by the throwing together of rooms. The other remained, and its effect on parental opinion was seen in the dropping off of numbers in the school. Then the small house system, familiar elsewhere, was introduced, the first tutor's house being opened in 1860, and two others shortly afterwards.[2]

The Prefects (as we shall see) were essentially the representatives of the mediating power and blind justice of the authorities; their weakness meant a reversion to the power of the strong over the weak; to bullying, and unauthorised fagging.[3]

1 Adams, op.cit., pp. 129, 236.
2 Ibid, p.236.
3 Ibid, pp. 130-1.

That these grew up too easily in Commoners was due to the bad arrangement of the rooms, and in general to the fact that for a varying, but usually large, number of Commoners (often more than 200) there were only eight Prefects, and four Senior Inferiors with similar powers. [1] The small house system was therefore favoured, and in 1869 New Commoners ceased to serve its former purpose, having been supplanted by the tutors' houses.

The "holy help of a wall" leads to this question of houses The original foundations of the schools had provided quarters and a common life for the foundationers themselves, where they were not the local residents. The "foreigners" or commensales had then been provided for in various ways. At Winchester they boarded with the Fellows; at Eton and Westminster private boarding establishments sprang up to cater for them; elsewhere they boarded with the Headmaster, and then with the assistant masters, as the number of these increased. This practice then spread back to Winchester, Eton and Westminster. It was thus possible for the house to be little if any larger than the form.

Thring favoured the small house, and it established itself in general favour. The numbers in an Eton house were commonly between twenty and thirty. In 1857 there were 25 houses for about 630 Oppidans. [3] Thring's purpose with the small house was to strengthen the influence of the master, and there is ample evidence that this object was achieved. [4] In one of the most famous of Eton houses (and the largest), Evans', there

---

1 Ibid., pp. 236-8.
2 Ibid., p. 239.
3 Brinsley-Richards, op.cit., p.49.
4 E.J.Cambier-Parry, op.cit., pp. 94-5.

were special circumstances. Fairly early in the history of the house William Evans had an accident which compelled him to hand over all but the nominal management to his daughters. Evans was therefore little known to his boys, but his two daughters in succession more than made up for this deficiency. "And then", wrote one former member of this house, "side by side with all this, was the family life we all shared - we were treated as part of the family. And of this family, Jane [1] was the one I clung to; she was my friend, and through life I have always looked at this friendship, from childhood, as one of the marked features of my existence. I think it was the family life I speak of which did so much to make Evans' what it was - the whole family dining with the boys ..... But besides this there were the invitations to breakfast, where we were then even more closely part of the family. I look back with the greatest interest to these parties. Then, lastly, there was my Dame's room, where the new and younger boys often went and sat, and enjoyed the happiness almost of home life." [2]

The unit of social life was commonly (and especially in large schools like Eton) the house rather than the school. At Eton, for instance, where we found no friendships between Collegers and Oppidans except among the senior boys, it was unusual (again with the exception of the seniors) for friendships to be formed between members of different houses. [3] For

---

1 Jane Evans had the house 1871-1906.

2 C.J.Cornish, quoted in Gambier-Parry, op.cit., p.83.

3 Ainger, op.cit., p.73.

most of his time at Eton a boy made his friends in his own house. The house, like the school, had a distinctive character which it impressed on its members. This being so, it was necessary, on Arnold's principle, that the Dame or tutor should exercise wide powers of exclusion and expulsion. When a boy rose to a position of seniority (e.g. by being the only Sixth Form) it was difficult to avoid making him Captain of the house, and giving him considerable power over his fellows, rather like the monitorial power in other schools. But - "one of Miss Evans' wise principles was never to allow a bad boy to remain till he was head of the house. At the risk of offending anyone, from a Duke downwards, she would request his withdrawal." [1]

Arnold had found the influence of the worst boys predominant. He inverted this position by using the monitorial system. All the schools had for long accorded a certain precedence and a varying amount of power to a class of boys called Prefects (at Winchester), Monitors (Westminster, Harrow, Charterhouse) or Praepostors (Eton, Rugby, Shrewsbury). Without going into the controversy over Arnold's achievements we may safely say that it was he that developed this system into the now familiar method of school government.

Arnold's development of the system at Rugby had two main objects: to increase his own influence over the whole school,[2] and to substitute a more reasonable government for the tyranny

---

1 Gambier-Parry, op.cit., p.93. This was after 1871, but the principle may have operated before.

2 Findlay, op.cit., p.64.

of the strong boys over the weak.[1] The two are closely connected. It seemed inevitable, if there were no established system of discipline among the boys, that the strong, even if not distinguished by any other qualities, would bully the weak, who might be much higher in the school. But by selecting praepostors from among the most outstanding in age, morality and intellect, and legalising their power over the others, the Head Master might undermine the prestige of physical strength. Arnold hoped by this method to substitute moral and intellectual for physical qualities in the schoolboys' cult, to some extent at least. And in as much as the praepostors thus chosen were also the Head Master's own form, the new cult might be further encouraged by more direct means. The continuously exerted influence of the Head could be brought to bear on all the members. On these principles Arnold set out to produce the new generation of Rugbeians that would appear to Oxford as a "solemn array".

Thring's theory of the subject is so similar, and expressed in words so nearly identical with Arnold's, that we can suppose the teaching of one to have inspired the other. The object is to attack the old evil of the school divided into two hostile camps, in which the ordinary rules of morality do not bind the one to the other. "Honour among thieves", Thring thinks, "is but another name for dishonour." But as the feeling against tale-bearing was so tenacious, let the gap be bridged by giving power to praepostors, who would have better opportunities of discovering what was happening among their fellows, and to whom other boys would bring

---

1 Ibid., pp. 230-4.

their complaints with less reluctance than to the masters. The necessity for the co-operation of the praepostors[1] in executing punishments, and the alternative of an appeal to the Head Master, would save the system from abuse.[2]

Arnold did not invent the praepostors. But when he came to Rugby they were a very different body from what he was afterwards to make of them. They were distinguished more by their privileges than by their duties, and were commonly mere bullies.[3] It was Arnold that made the monitorial system a fundamental element in the public school. All the members of the sixth form at Rugby were praepostors: "they are those who have risen to the highest form in the school - that is to say, they will probably be at once the oldest, and the strongest, and the cleverest; and further, if the school be well ordered, they will be the most respectable in application and general character- those who have made the best use of the opportunities which the school affords, and are most capable of entering into its objects."[4]

This school government had for its subject population the fags, who comprised all the rest of the school except the Twenty and the Fifth Form, which came immediately below the Sixth.[5] The latter had power to punish the fags for such offences as smoking, drinking and breaking bounds; "and their business is ..... especially to prevent that ill-usage of the weaker boys by the stronger which is so often ignorantly confounded with a system

1 Cf. the Justices of the Peace.
2 Thring, Education and School, pp. 241-2.
3 Rouse, History of Rugby School, pp. 146, 186-9
4 Findlay, op.cit., p.230.
5 Rouse, op.cit., p.257.

of fagging." [1] We are not concerned with the services which the fags had to perform for their Sixth Form masters; nor with the bearing upon the general polity of England of this education in obedience and command. The outstanding fact for us about the monitorial system was that by bridging the gulf between masters and boys it made the boys more amenable to the influence of the masters, and more especially of the Head Master.

At Uppingham, as at Rugby, the monitorial power was in the hands of the Sixth Form. See what Thring records of it in March, 1860: "Another satisfactory thing to-night. The sixth form have met and have made some resolutions for the better ordering of the school in various little matters of discipline, which they have given out in every house, and it has been well received. The government is beginning to work, and the principles to leaven the mass. This is the first public identification of the upper boys with the system in ordinary routine." [2]

Arnold's system spread to all the other public schools except Eton; or one might say that their own monitorial systems were modified by the example of Rugby, which reached them partly through old Rugbeians and old Rugby masters who joined their staffs, partly through the publicity (the daily press and Tom Brown's Schooldays) that Arnold's Rugby enjoyed. [3] The monitorial system found many unfavourable critics. Contemporaries did not all agree that the ideals of Arnold and Thring had been realised. Prefects were prigs, tyrants, too big for their boots, or else they were the athletes

1 Findlay, op.cit., p.230.
2 Parkin, op.cit., p.100.
3 And see the articles in Findlay, op.cit., Part IV.

of the school and so set just the standard that Arnold wanted to abolish.[1] On the other hand the almost universal adoption of the system is an argument for its success.

In considering the influences which thus impressed a common stamp on a school and its members, we must not omit the intangible and yet most tangible factor of the material shell of the school community. A common character was produced by attachment to the same buildings and the traditions with which, often, a long history had surrounded them. "It seems to me", said Arnold, "that there is, or ought to be, something very ennobling in being connected with any establishment at once ancient and magnificent; where all about us, and all the associations belonging to the objects around us, should be great, splendid, and elevating. What an individual ought (sic), and often does, derive from the feeling that he is born of an old and illustrious race, from being familiar, from his childhood, with the walls and with the trees that speak of the past no less than of the present, and make both full of images of greatness; this, in an inferior degree, belongs to every member of an ancient and celebrated place of education." [2]

Many factors thus contributed to the same result - the establishment of a clearly defined "tone" or "stamp" which was impressed upon every boy who passed through a school. "I consider", said Dr. Moberly, Headmaster of Winchester, to the Commission, "the stamp a boy receives from a school of this kind to be extremely definite. I believe it is so with most public schools, but

---

1 W.L.C., The Public Schools, pp. 301-2. 389; Anon., Our Public Schools, p. 91.

2 Findlay, on.cit., p.137

this school, I think, has a clearly defined stamp or mint mark. I know the general character of the boys who issue from the top of this school perfectly well." [1] This was the result of the common life of the school and the way it was organised - houses, prefects, the strength of public opinion, the weight of traditions, the common attachment to a place and its associations. (Cf. the well-known definition of a nation as a body of people united by a common hatred of their neighbours and a common error about their own past).

The result of Arnold's reforms, of Thring's, and in general of the changes in public school life which began in the Early Victorian age, was to increase the influence of the masters, and especially of the Headmasters, over the lives, morals and characters of the boys.

What was the nature of this influence? To what social types did the masters belong? They must, in general, be assigned to what we have called the transitional class. They were drawn some from upper class homes, some from the professional classes, and with very few exceptions they had themselves received a public school education. The Headmasterships of the wealthier schools, and the assistant masterships where these involved the tenure of boarding-houses, were remunerative [2] enough to attract a sufficient number of idealists of the cultivated classes. The profession had not, however, in our period, attained the social prestige which would give its members a very honourable position in Society. For this reason more than any other they found it necessary to combine the academic with the clerical character. [3] Arnold at least explains the necessity of the combination in this way. There seems also to have been a popular suspicion that if a schoolmaster had not taken orders,

1. P.S.C. Evidence, Vol.III, p. 364, Q 684. Cf. p.360, Q.681.
2. Parkin, op.cit., p.188.
3. Findlay, op.cit., p.39.

it must have been because of his sense of his unfitness to do so. The clerical habit seemed the only guarantee of the moral fitness of a master for his responsible task. [1] It also opened up the road to promotion. The clerical master might hope at his retirement for a prebendary stall of a cathedral, or a fellowship of Eton; and beyond these he could aspire to a bishopric, in which high office many schoolmasters ended their careers. [2]

It was about 1860 that the preponderance of the clergy among public school masters was first weakened. [3] That this change did not lead to a marked decline in the character of the masters is due largely to the nobility of spirit of many who entered the profession, to the idealism with which it had been connected by the example of many notable careers. The layman had few chances of promotion outside the academic world, but there were leaves and fishes even in the schools themselves. When only classical assistant masters had a full and recognised status in the school, the number capable of holding houses was much smaller than it later became; no young classical master at Eton had long to wait for a house.

We have spoken of Arnold and of Thring. As Thring ruled Uppingham from 1853 to 1887, his influence on the adult world lies mostly outside our period; but a final word on Arnold may be said. He achieved that which Dr. Hawkins had prophesied of him, he "changed the face of public education throughout England." [4]

---

1 Archer, op. cit., p. 77.
2 Ainger, op. cit., pp. 535-6
3 Ibid., p. 241.
4 Findlay, op. cit., p. 28.

This statement has been a matter of acute controversy, in which the final judgment has been substantially in favour of its truth. [1] It is agreed that there was a reformation all through the public schools, that Arnold was connected with the beginning of it, and that its principles were his. As a recent writer has pointed out, the reform of the details of school organisation would not have been impossible for a second-rate man, but the changing of the moral tone of the public schools "required individuality of a high order, and it is to the changes which took place in this sphere, the changes which did more than anything else to conciliate public opinion, that Arnold's admirers look for their main proofs of his influence." [2]

Those who read his sermons and his letters, and are not determined to see priggishness in what was only zeal expressed in the pious phraseology of the time, will find adequate proof of his "individuality of a high order." There he evinces a determination to raise the moral standards of his school to the level of his own, then a recognition of the impossibility of this in a society of boys, then again a determination "to form Christian men, for Christian boys I can scarcely hope to make." [3] Every Sunday during term, for nearly eleven years, he preached to his pupils in the school chapel, always keeping this object before him. It would be wrong to suggest that he realised it completely, or to use a few outstanding examples among his pupils as illustrations of his success. But most of his pupils passed through his own form, where, as praepostors, they were

---

1 Archer, op.cit., the whole of Chapter III.

2 Ibid., p.54.

3 As he had feared before going to Rugby. Cf. Findlay, op.cit., p.30.

drawn into the system which we have seen changing the moral condition of the school; and this they did while under Arnold's direct influence.

Especially during the later part of his tenure of Rugby, the personal impression he made on his pupils generally became very great. One boy for instance, who while at school had no personal communication with Arnold, nevertheless writes in this way: "I am sure that I do not exaggerate my feelings when I say, that I felt a love and reverence for him as one of quite awful greatness and goodness, for whom I well remember that I used to think I would gladly lay down my life; I used to think that I too had a work to do for him in the school, and I did for his sake labour to raise the tone of the set I lived in, particularly as regarded himself." [1]

It is natural that the impression he made, and the influence he exerted, if considerable on the Sixth Form, were greater on the masters. In choosing these, it was his object "to get here a society of intelligent, gentlemanly and active men." [2] This apparently he was able to do. "Out of his own family, there was no circle, of which he was so completely the animating principle, as amongst those who co-operated with him in the great practical work of his life." [3]

The change effected at Rugby was due partly to Arnold's unique personality, partly to his system. The chief features of this were the power given to the Sixth Form, and the assumption of the office of school chaplain by the Headmaster. It seemed to him

---

1 Findlay, op.cit, pp. 114-5.

2 Ibid., p.52 n.

3 Ibid., p.52.

"the natural and fitting thing, and the great advantage of having a separate chapel for the school - that the master of the boys should be officially as well as really their pastor." [1]

If Arnold and Thring stood out among Headmasters as great originators, there were others who at least could stand comparison with them. Two of Arnold's immediate successors at Rugby were future Archbishops of Canterbury. Of Tait it is said that "no archbishop probably since the Reformation had so much weight in Parliament or in the country generally." [2] Temple was largely responsible for modernising the school curriculum, and presided over a distinguished body of masters whose missionary achievements we are about to consider.

Of the other great headmasters of the time the most outstanding was probably Samuel Butler of Shrewsbury (1798-1836), who had been educated at Rugby under Dr. James. His distinctive contribution to the reform of the schools was the development of the examination system and of an enthusiasm in his pupils who were made to "believe that Latin and Greek were the only things worth living for." [3] Butler was succeeded at Shrewsbury by one of his own pupils, Kennedy (1836-66), who was an enthusiastic admirer of his master's system; so much so that he gave up the certainty of financial security, and the prospect of preferment, at Harrow, for the less gainful position at Shrewsbury where he wanted to carry on Butler's work. [4]

There is less to say about the earlier masters of Winchester, Eton and Harrow, because while many of them were very successful in developing the system which they found existing in those schools,

---

1 Ibid., p.100 n.
2 Concise D.N.B., p. 1272.
3 Butler's Life & Letters. Vol. i, p.211, quoted in Fisher, Annals of Shrewsbury School, p.305.
4 Fisher, op.cit., p.329.

they had not such original and important contributions to make to it as the others we have named.

It has been said that each of the greater schools had a distinctive character and "stamp" of its own. Yet those characters, and those of the new nineteenth century public schools, were only variants of a common type. This resemblance may be attributed to the similarity of the conditions under which the schools evolved. But when deliberate changes were made in the mid-nineteenth century, their universal spread must have been due to more easily traceable links between schools. The chief of those links was the migration of masters.

Most interesting in this connection is the spreading influence of the new Rugby. One of Arnold's pupils, C.J.Vaughan, having failed to get appointed as his master's successor, became Headmaster of Harrow (1844-59) and was able completely to regenerate that school. [1] When Marlborough after its rebellion in 1851 looked like being a failure, its position was retrieved by Cotton, a disciple of Arnold's; and he was succeeded in 1858 by another Rugbeian, Bradley. [2] "Wellington won its position under Benson (1859-68), a pupil of Prince Lee, one of Arnold's masters, at Birmingham, and himself a master at Rugby; Haileybury under A.G.Butler (1861-7), a pupil at Rugby under Tait and a master under Temple; Clifton under Percival (1862-78), another Rugby master. Of the older schools which developed on the same lines, Repton owes its position

---

1 P.M. Thornton, Harrow School and its Surroundings, Ch. XII.

2 Archer, op.cit., pp. 72-5.

to Pears (1854-74), a house-master at Harrow under Vaughan, who raised the numbers from fifty to 250." [1] Some of these had been masters at Rugby under Temple. Others in the same position were J.M.Wilson (Clifton, 1878), Charles Evans (King Edward's School, Birmingham, 1862), T.W. Jex-Blake (Cheltenham, 1869), J.S.Phillpotts (Bedford) and J. Robertson (Haileybury). These examples show how widely the influence of Arnold and of Rugby must have been felt. [2]

This influence did not directly affect Eton or Winchester, which were ruled all through the period by Etonians and Wykehamists respectively. That they exercised influence on others is suggested by the fact that Arnold was a product of Winchester, and Thring of Eton. The power of Winchester was felt more noticeably when the High Church party began to suspect that the cult of Rugby was not favourable to their principles. Although Arnold had brought much (many of his ideas about the prefect system, for instance) from his old school to Rugby, a certain antithesis between the two was thought to exist. In the new schools that were founded on Anglo-Catholic rather than Evangelical principles, both systems and masters were often imported from Winchester in preference to Rugby. Mr. Archer quotes Bradfield, Lancing and Radley as in this class. [3]

Harrow and Westminster, unlike Winchester and Eton, generously admitted outside influences. The greatest Headmaster of Westminster during the century, Liddell, came from Charterhouse. [4]

---

1 Ibid., p.74.
2 Rouse, op.cit., p.300.
3 Archer, op.cit., p.75.
4 D.N.B. Suppl. iii, p.94.

Of Harrow headmasters, George Butler had been educated in his father's private school; Longley was a "estminster; [1] we have already spoken of Vaughan, a Rugbeian.

Thus mutual influence as well as common circumstances made the public schools into a body of institutions united in strong resemblances, and in consequence the products of these schools had resemblances too, and constituted a type which could be distinguished clearly from others, even through it included considerable variations in itself.

Since this public school type was becoming increasingly coincident with the governing class of England, it is relevant to ask what the type was. What did a public school education do for the governing class? We have seen that it introduced some homogeneity of ideas and habits into the class of people who emerged from the schools, and that it thereby fused together what had before been diverse elements. Thus a writer of 1881 could refer to "the common expression, 'I send my son to school to be made a gentleman of.' " The system, he thinks, may have been "rendered necessary by the sudden rise to wealth of our middle class, and a consciousness on their part that they are incapable of training their own families." [2] Further back, in 1860, a satirical writer in the Cornhill Magazine [3] relates how "numbers of the wealthy of the middle classes sent their sons to Harchester in imitation of their betters." This point, however, has been sufficiently brought out in the present

1 D.N.B., xxxiv, p.121.
2 Anon., Our Public Schools, p.315
3 Vol. I, p.611.

chapter. What must now be asked is what difference the public school made to those who would still have been gentlemen if brought up at home, or on any other system.

There is a remarkable amount of agreement among nineteenth century writers that the public school, by withdrawing boys from daily association with mothers and sisters, made them thereby coarse and immoral. This point is made, e.g., in the Edinburgh Review in 1810; [1] constantly reiterated by Arnold; [2] and the writer of 1881, already quoted, not only supports this view, [3] but makes the interesting suggestion that Eton and Harrow should accommodate day boys coming by train from London. Rugby would provide similarly for the midland industrial towns, and so with the rest. [4]

That the vice which gave most anxiety to school authorities was homosexualism is not, of course, clearly stated, but appears fairly distinctly through the mass of circumlocution with which Victorian writers tried to cover it up. [5] The chief significance of this is as a startling symptom of the artificiality of boarding-school life. It would be a safe guess to say that public school boys of the nineteenth century were at least too familiar with homosexualism, and at least not sufficiently at ease or natural in feminine company.

On the other hand Arnold's crusade - it can hardly

---

1 Vol. XVI, pp. 326-54.
2 See, e.g., Findlay, op.cit., pp. 124, 130, 174-9, 235.
3 Our Public Schools, pp. 555-9.
4 Ibid., pp. 366-73.
5 E.g., ibid., pp. 355-6; Findlay, op.cit., pp. 175-6.

be called less - was at any rate partly successful, and in his opinion the chief object of a school was to produce Christian gentlemen: "what we must look for herein, 1st, religious and moral principles; 2ndly, gentlemanly conduct; 3rdly, intellectual ability." [1] Under the system as it developed during and after Arnold's time, the influence of the masters over the boys' characters greatly increased, and there can be no doubt that that influence was directed to the formation of "Christian gentlemen".

During the period before 1867 sport was still far from being the organised cult that it has since become; this is evident from Tom Brown's Schooldays, and from such a curious prophecy as this one in 1867: "Great exertions are being made, just at present, to effect some kind of adjustment of football rules in general, so as to adopt one universal code, under which matches between the different schools may be played, as in the case of cricket. The success of any such movement, however, is very doubtful." [2] Nevertheless, sports of various kinds, some archaic and some childish ones alongside the more respectable amusements of cricket, rowing and squash, were regarded as an outstanding feature of public school life even before our period. [3] Various interpretations have been placed on Wellington's famous remark about the playing-fields of Eton, but there can be little doubt that the Duke's high opinion of Westminster as a training ground for the army found its justification in the Spartan hardships which that school inflicted on its members.[4]

1 Findlay, op.cit., p.65.
2 W.L.C., The Public Schools, p.67.
3 E.g., Edinburgh Review, Vol. XVI (1810), pp. 326-34.
4 W.L.C., op.cit., pp. 135-6, 139-40, and Chapter IV, passim.

It would be very difficult to say how far the spirit of fair play, or, for short, "cricket", was inculcated into the nineteenth century governing class by public school games. At least Arnold in his sermons gave the schoolboys he knew precious little credit for any high moral principles. What is pretty certain about school games is that they had a levelling effect within the school. Blue blood meant nothing on the cricket or football field or the river. If it be said that it meant nothing in the schoolroom either, the answer is that success in the schoolroom meant little in the boys' eyes, but success on the field meant much. The captain of the eleven or the boats was no less an unapproachable, "swell" for his father's being a merchant.

Much the same result followed from the prefect system. The young duke began his school career on a fag. For these reasons the public school, because it was a boarding school and had an organised corporate life, "democratised the aristocracy", as was pointed out by Lord John Russell in an obscure passage which deserves quotation:

"The democratic character of the nobility of England, the democracy of the aristocracy, if I may be allowed so to call it, is very much to be attributed to the gregarious education they receive. In this manner, her public schools form a part of the constitution of the country. If they produce some vice and a good deal of rudeness, they subdue pride, selfishness, and conceit; they create emulation, friendship, and a manly strength of mind.

Let anyone watch the education of a youth of high expectations in Spain or Italy; he will see him followed everywhere by a servile flatterer, under the name of a preceptor, learning nothing but the varnish and the falsehood of the world; the idol of his parents and the torment of his friends. Men of sense, who have undergone this dangerous ordeal, all speak with envy and admiration of the public schools of England."[1]

So much for the manners and morals of the Public School boys in general. Arnold's third requisite, which the public, like him, regarded as less important than the training of Christian gentlemen, was the intellectual side of education. We have seen that the Classics were traditionally regarded as the appropriate schooling for gentlemen. Thorstein Veblen, in The Theory of the Leisure Class, explains this taste in terms of the uselessness of classical learning. The leisure class, by showing publicly that it could afford to "waste its time" in learning dead languages, heraldry or etiquette, would demonstrate its superiority to the people who had to learn bookkeeping or handcrafts.[2] This view is borne out by many of the arguments used in defence of the classical curriculum. At Cambridge in the middle of the seventeenth century the study of mathematics was discouraged on the ground that it was "the business of traders, merchants, seamen, carpenters or the like, and perhaps some almanack makers in London".[3] When the old curriculum came to be challenged in the nineteenth century, its defenders cast about for any weapons that might be handy, and discovered the unrivalled excellence of the classics as a training in mental discipline,

---

1. Quoted in Quarterly Review (1834), Vol lii, p. 138
2. Op. Cit, p. 46
3. A. K. Cook, About Winchester College, pp. 315-6, quoting Mullinger.

reasoning powers and the use of the mother tongue itself. They could not offer the modern argument that the study of ancient life in all its aspects provides a sound general training in the understanding of the modern world, because English scholarship had lagged far behind the continental in appreciating the subject matter of ancient literature. It concentrated upon the form, and classical study was chiefly a training in verbal ingenuity.

T. H. Huxley could afterwards[1] parody this type of scholarship in referring to a new Public School Latin Primer: "I could get up an osteological primer so arid, so pedantic in its terminology, so altogether distasteful to the youthful mind, as to beat the recent production of the headmasters out of the field in all these excellences. Next I could exercise my boys upon easy fossils, and bring out all their powers of memory and all their ingenuity in the application of my osteo-grammatical rules to the interpretation, or construing of those fragments. To those who had reached the higher classes, I might supply odd bones to be built up into animals, giving great honour and reward to him who succeeded in fabricating monsters most entirely in accordance with the rules. That would answer to verse-making and essay-writing in the dead languages".

Verse-making was, indeed, the supreme end of classical teaching. It is not necessary nowadays to discuss its value for pupils who were ignorant of almost everything else, including the life, thought and history of the ancient world itself. The system did not encourage thought in the broad sense. The exercise of memory and the application of memorised rules were the chief

1. Quoted in Adamson, English Education, 1789-1902. p. 317.

features of this monotonous time-table of translation and composition.

Academic conservatism and inertia were the real reason for the maintenance of this system; specious arguments were only an excuse. The old-fashioned clergymen in charge of most schools had picked up, in the course of their own education, the traditional methods of teaching the classics. They could not have taught any other subject except by using, where it was applicable, the old method in the way facetiously suggested by Huxley. They did, in fact, do this very thing when they turned their hands to the modern languages, and the mark of Donatus can still be seen on all but the most modern grammar books of English.

Tough and tenacious as this old growth was, it could not flourish well in the utilitarian atmosphere of the nineteenth century. Bentham had accustomed people to look searchingly into every institution and ask what its use might be. The Edinburgh Review, therefore, fixed its attention upon Eton in 1830 [1] and upon Westminster in 1831 [2], and there was no lack of material for a slashing attack. Apart from the narrowness of the curriculum, the teaching of the classical languages themselves came in for criticism - the absurd selection from classical authors, the faultiness and obscurity of the grammar books. The Quarterly Review came to the defence of Eton in 1834 [3], but could find no better argument than that the instruction there gave the boys a taste for the classics, a statement incapable of proof or disproof.

That it would have been difficult to substantiate the claim

---

1. Vol. 51, pp. 66-80.
2. Vol. 53, pp. 64-82.
3. Vol. 52, pp. 128-77.

is suggested by the conclusions of the Clarendon Commission, which the Times summarised in 1864 as follows:

"In one word we may say that they find it (Public School education) to be a failure - a failure even if tested by those better specimens, not exceeding one-third of the whole, who go up to the Universities. Though a very large number of these have literally nothing to show for the results of the school hours from childhood to manhood but a knowledge of Latin and Greek, with a little English and arithmetic, we have here the strongest testimony that their knowledge of the former is most inaccurate, and their knowledge of the latter contemptible.....the great multitude cannot construe an easy author at sight, or write Latin prose without glaring mistakes, or answer simple questions in grammar, or get through a problem in the first two books of Euclid, or apply the higher rules of arithmetic..... 'Most of them', says an Oxford tutor of great experience and judgment, 'are persons who were allowed as boys to carry their idleness from form to form, to work below their powers and merely to move with the crowd; they are men of whom something might have been made, but it is now too late; they are grossly ignorant, and have contracted slovenly habits of mind.' " [1] So much for the mental discipline obtained from the old kind of classical training.

The more important criticisms of Public School teaching were, however, directed at the neglect of other subjects than Latin and Greek. Before 1836 there was no mathematical teaching at Eton.[2] The subject entered Winchester modestly in 1834.[3] It was made compulsory at Harrow in 1837, two hours a week in the Fourth form and

---

1. Quoted in Bernard Darwin, The English Public School, pp. 107-8
2. Maxwell Lyte, History of Eton College, p. 436.
3. A.K. Cook, op.cit p. 320.

three hours above that.[1] A beginning was made at Merchant Taylors', afterwards famous for its mathematics, in 1828.[2] At St. Paul's the teaching of this subject, recently introduced, was described as "chaotic" in 1864.[3]

Modern languages followed mathematics in these schools at a respectful distance. Modern languages usually meant French only, which appeared at St. Pauls in 1853, at Harrow in 1851-6, at Eton (half-heartedly, and at the instigation of the Prince Consort) in 1841.

In these matters Rugby was well ahead of other schools. As early as the time of Dr. James (1778-94) attention was being paid to English composition, English history, mathematics and geography.[4] This was a good basis for Arnold (1828-42), who not only gave greater emphasis to these subjects, but showed his familiarity with the trend of continental scholarship by placing the emphasis in classical studies on the content instead of the form.

The mere introduction of modern studies was not enough to effect the almost exclusive predominance of Latin and Greek. Other subjects were at first not merely extras, confined to voluntary pupils, but were to be studied out of school hours, in play time, on half-holidays. When compulsion began the new subjects took up what had formerly been holiday times, with what effect on their popularity may be imagined. The marks given for them had, at first, no effect on the pupil's position in school or examinations, and later on, when they were taken into consideration, they still counted for much less than marks in classical lessons. The masters who taught them were

---

1. P.S.C. Report, vol 1, pp. 214-5.
2. Merchant Taylor's School (see Bibliography), p. 62.
3. C.M. Picciotto, St. Paul's, p. 40.
4. W.H.D.Rouse, History of Rugby School, pp. 137-40; A.K.Cook, op. cit, p. 316.

treated as an inferior class, with no full status in the school, and this treatment was very evident to their pupils. These were serious handicaps to overcome.[1]

If there were obstacles in the way of mathematics, French, English and modern history, there were still greater ones keeping scientific subjects out of the curriculum. The greatest was perhaps the complete unfamiliarity of schoolmasters and authorities with the scientific outlook and method. They treated science as newfangled, "unstable", consequently lacking in well-defined principles, in fact as a mere haphazard succession of discoveries and marvels which one ought to know about as one knows the news in the daily paper.[2] Faraday, who gave evidence to the Clarendon Commission, pointed out that the difficulty of teaching science lay in the lack of a class of men trained to teach it.[3]

The beginnings of science teaching were not made in the old Public Schools. New brooms proverbially sweep clean, and new curricula, suited to the times, were introduced from the beginning in the proprietary schools of the Victorian era. Clifton, for instance, taught science from the year of its foundation, 1862, and a physics and chemistry laboratory was built in 1867.[4] The Clarendon Commission took evidence from three of the proprietary schools, Cheltenham, Marlborough and Wellington, and were thereby provided with an example in many ways sharply contrasting with what they saw in the older schools.

---

1. For a concise account see A.K.Cook, op.cit;,pp. 315-21. A fuller account of the whole question is given in Adamson, English Education, 1789-1902. ch. 9.
2. Adamson, op. cit. pp. 242-3.
3. Ibid; p. 246.
4. O.F.Christie, History of Clifton College. pp. 206-7.

Behind the practical trend away from the purely classical curriculum lay two closely related changes of theory. There was, inevitably, a hankering after "useful knowledge", and there was a change in the conception of what constituted leisure class culture. "We find modern languages", said Lord Clarendon, "geography, history, chronology and everything else which a well-educated English gentleman ought to know given up in order that the full time should be devoted to the classics"[1]. Much of this broadening of outlook was mere change of fashion. Modern languages would have been as useful to the eighteenth century buck as they were to his great-grandson. Nothing had happened suddenly to make modern history a more genteel subject than it had been before. Nevertheles these developments were in an indirect sense the product of the Industrial Revolution. As the basis of the leisure class broadened, good society was brought into contact with an increasing number of people whose social position was due to success in the battle of wits, and with many who continued to practise learned professions. We saw that the more plebeian guests of the great, early in the century, had been largely men of wit and conversation, but that at the mid-Victorian period they were more often professional scholars, scientists, journalists, or financiers. Polite society was thus brought into closer contact with the world of affairs, and it was all the more necessary for the conversationalist to know where Calcutta was, why the bank rate had fallen and what geologists had to say about the Creation. In a word, the participation of working people in leisure class culture gave that culture a more utilitarian bias.

---

1. Adamson, op. cit., p. 239.

At the same time the strictly utilitarian arguments against the old curriculum began to make an appeal to the upper class. At all times a great number of cadets of good families had found employment in various respectable professions, including the Church, the Army and the Civil Service. The conditions of entry into those professions became more exacting as the nineteenth century advanced. A clerical career involved a University degree. The Universities now prescribed written examinations in the place of the old empty medieval formalities, Cambridge since the middle of the eighteenth century, Oxford since 1800. The Cambridge Previous Examination and Oxford Responsions required a knowledge of mathematics as well as Latin, Greek and Scripture. Cambridge introduced a Classical Tripos in 1824, but until 1850 it was available only to those who had secured mathematical honours. In 1851 the first examinations in the Moral Sciences Tripos and the Natural Sciences Tripos were set. Oxford introduced two new T[illegible] schools, one in law and modern history and the other in natural science, in 1852, the existing schools being Literæ Humaniores and Mathematics. The candidate for Honours had to pass in Litt. Hum. and one other school.[1]

All this was very different from the slipshod University career for which the Public Schools were intended as a preparation. One of the charges levelled at the Schools by the Commission was that their old boys did badly at the Universities, even in the classics, while they were quite unprepared for the study of other subjects.[2] The broadening of the University curriculum would

---

1. The whole subject is covered in Adamson, op.cit, ch. 3, 7.
2. Ibid., pp. 239-40.

therefore necessarily have its effect on the Schools.

The easy paths into the Army and Civil Service had become thornier too. Examinations for Commissions were inflicted on Ensigns and Lieutenants from 1850[1], and Woolwich and Sandhurst, with their exacting requirements in mathematics and other subjects, drew recruits from various schools. Commissions were still purchased, until 1871, but the need to pass examinations in the Army affected the attitude of many Public Schools to the new studies. Examinations for the East India Service were introduced, at the suggestion of a commission presided over by Macauley, in 1853. For the Home Civil Service they began in 1855, although individual departments had introduced them earlier. They were qualifying, not competitive examinations, and appointments and promotions remained subject to patronage till the competitive examination system was introduced in 1870. But Public School boys who formerly had drifted into the Civil Service by favour of an uncle would now require to know a little mathematics and modern history and perhaps a modern language.[2] It is interesting to note that while Anthony Trollope and others frankly asked for the better posts to be reserved for upper class candidates, Benjamin Jowett served the same end by his suggestion that the examinations should comprise the subjects already taught in the Public Schools, at Oxford and Cambridge and the Scottish Universities.[3] These methods would, of course, have much the same result, and the transition to competitive examination in 1870 did not in fact open the floodgates

---

1. G.M.Young, Early Victorian England. vol. 1, p. 359.
2. E.Cohen, The Growth of the British Civil Service, pp.101-2 and ch. 6 - 8.
3. Ibid.

of democracy.

The upper class, on behalf of its less fortunate brethren, therefore demanded a utilitarian education to fit candidates for the Universities(and the professions served thereby), the Civil Service and Army examinations. At the same time it regarded this sort of education as more suited than the old purely classical one to the needs of a gentleman of leisure and polish. An incidental result of the change was to remove one of the barriers that had kept plebeian elements out of the Public Schools. We found those elements, at the beginning of our period, rejecting classical schooling for their children, even when very liberal facilities for it were available; this on the ground that it would not prepare them for gainful occupations. We saw also that entrance to a Public School presupposed an adequate preparatory schooling, which the children of the poor were not likely to get. At the end of the period we find the Public School deliberately preparing candidates for professional careers, and at the same time Forster's Education Act of 1870 marked a great advance in the elementary education of the poorer classes. The rest of that story lies outside our limits, but even in 1870 it was possible to foresee the time when, if the lower classes were excluded from the Public Schools, it would not be by their inability to profit from the schooling, nor by the uselessness of that schooling as a training for work.

Many of the advances in curriculum and spirit had been made by the Public Schools, as we have seen, on their own initiative. Others followed the report of the Clarendon Commission and the consequent Act of 1868. The Commission could

not, of course, itself interfere in the working of the schools. It realised that the key to all other changes was the reform of the governing bodies, and this is what the Act of 1868 achieved. Eton had been under the government of a Provost and ten fellows, who appointed to vacancies in their own number and had no function but to enjoy some of the college revenues and to interfere (the Provost's work) with the Headmaster in the performance of his duty. These were now superseded by a Governing Body consisting of the Provosts of Eton and King's and representatives appointed by the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, the Royal Society, the Lord Chief Justice and the Masters of the school. These co-opted a further two, three or four. The appointments were for life, but unpaid, except that the two Provosts held paid offices. The Governing Body of Winchester was constituted in the same way, with the Wardens of Winchester and New College and an additional representative of the latter College taking the place of the Provosts, and the number of co-opted members fixed at three. At Rugby the Trustees continued to administer the Charity, but not the School. The Governing Body was of the type we have seen in the other cases: the Lord-Lieutenant of Warwickshire in the chair, one member each appointed by Oxford, Cambridge, the Royal Society, the Lord Chancellor, the Masters and the Trustees.

This kind of reform paved the way for carrying out the Commission's recommendations - in a general way - in the educational field. These may be briefly summarised.[1] The Commissioners would retain the classics as the main and central subject of tuition, but they wanted every pupil to be taught in addition arithmetic, the

---

1. See Edinburgh Review, vol. 120, pp. 147-87.

elements of geometry, algebra, plane trigonometry, at least one modern language, the elements of natural science, and either music or drawing. Divinity of course found a place, and they wanted more attention paid also to English composition and orthography. They drew up a time-table dividing the hours of the week among these subjects. The new governing bodies would have the responsibility of adapting these suggestions to their respective circumstances.

Thus the Public Schools, which fused together the old and the new upper classes, succumbed to the force of the Industrial Revolution and embarked upon the task of educating for work. Did this mean that they would also, in time, spread the inheritance of cultured leisure over the wide social expanse of "the poor", "the mob", "the lower orders"? The answer to that question lay far away in the future.

CHAPTER VI.

FROM THE GENERAL TO THE PARTICULAR.

The preceding chapters have presented a general picture of the changing society of England between 1815 and 1867, the reflection of these changes in the political system, and the part played by the educational system in the transition. The picture would be more vivid and the argument, perhaps, more acceptable if we could illustrate these processes with a number of individual examples. The social change described in the first chapter was provided with such illustrations. We shall now in the same way illuminate the subjects of the remaining chapters, in particular the social basis of the political system and the use of the Public Schools as a solvent of social classes.

To exhibit the social character of the House of Commons it would be sufficient to examine in detail a representative cross-section of it, and it would be impracticable to do more. Such a cross-section is provided by a number of counties, with the boroughs in them, distributed throughout England and differing significantly in their political character. These differences will appear in the course of the examination. Our selection comprises three populous counties, Hampshire, Shropshire and Buckinghamshire, and two small ones, Huntingdonshire and Westmoreland, including a total of twenty-five two-member boroughs before 1832. These were reduced by the Reform Act to fifteen two-member and three one-member boroughs, while the county constituencies were divided, so as to return sixteen members instead of ten. We shall conclude with a glance at some of the newly enfranchised industrial towns.

The Boroughs before 1832 were to a large extent "rotten", the nature and degree of the patron's control varying in different boroughs and at different times. Professor L. B. Namier, in The Structure of Politics at the Accession of George III, has described this control for the year 1761, and in many cases we find the same families exercising it on the eve of the Reform Act. Where the control was obtained solely through the ownership of vote-giving property, of burgage tenures for instance, it was of course removed in 1832. But in many boroughs the patron's influence was based on a long-standing association with the electors, their gratitude for his past favours and lively sense of favours to come, which were not diminished by the Reform Act. The factor of social pressure was especially important in small boroughs. Even after 1832 there was no secret ballot, and in the small boroughs that survived the elector preferred not to incur the displeasure of the magnate round whom much local trade and all social life revolved. This pressure would not be exercised where there were two or more magnates in the locality, attached to different parties. In the unreformed constituencies the patron's influence was often based not merely on favours or social eminence, or on the control of burgage tenures which gave the vote, but on the ownership of land and various other kinds of property in the borough. This factor remained after 1832.

We begin with the Parliaments of 1818, 1820 and 1826, and with the members for the boroughs only. Hampshire, including the Isle of Wight, had twelve boroughs. Stockbridge had a scot and lot franchise, but a small electorate. The burgage boroughs were Whitchurch, Petersfield and Newtown (Isle of Wight). The freemen were the voters in Southampton, and numbered between 500 and 1,000.

All the rest were corporation boroughs, namely Andover, Winchester, Portsmouth, Lymington, Christchurch, Newport and Yarmouth. The most democratic of these, in theory, would be Stockbridge, with its scot and lot franchise, but it was small enough and corrupt enough to be subject to the control of Joseph Foster Barham,[1] a West Indian proprietor and Lord of the Manor of Stockbridge. He was not altogether a novus homo, as he inherited Trecwm, Pembrokeshire, from his mother. He represented the borough himself in 1818, together with George Porter, but the latter was displaced in 1820 by the patron's son John Foster Barham. The strain of boroughmongering seems then to have been too great for the family. Stockbridge was sold to General (afterwards Field-Marshal) Thomas Grosvenor. The members in 1826 were the General himself and George Wilbraham, his brother-in-law. Grosvenor and Wilbraham were both Cheshire families.

Petersfield was a burgage borough under the "influence" of the Jolliffe[2] family, who had a seat, Heath House, outside the town, and a principal seat in Surrey. Hylton Jolliffe, member in 1818, 1820 and 1826 was the third generation of his family to represent the place. His colleagues in the three elections were George Canning (not the great statesman, but his cousin, afterwards Lord Garvagh), Sir Philip Musgrave and William Marshall respectively. These men were not strangers to the Jolliffes. Mr. Jolliffe's mother had been

---

1. Porritt, op. cit., vol. i, p. 361. V.C.H.Hants, iv, 484. Gent Mag N.S. 102, p. 573. Ann. Reg.(1832), Chron. 219-20.
2. Burke, Peerage (1892), pp. 743-4. To avoid a surfeit of footnotes we may explain here that most of the men that follow may be found in Burke's Peerage or Landed Gentry (according to their standing), and the distinguished ones in the Dictionary of National Biography. We shall give other references only where these do not serve. For the references to education the respective school registers were used, and will not be specified in footnotes.

a Hylton of Hayton Castle, Cumberland; one branch of the Musgraves held the same castle at another time, and a relationship between them is not unlikely. Sir Philip's niece and Lord Garvagh himself both married into the Bonham family, which suggests some earlier association of Musgraves and Cannings. William Marshall was the son of a wealthy flax spinner who was also a landowner - and his own seat was Patterdale Hall, Cumberland. Thus Hylton Jolliffe's mother introduced to Petersfield a Cumberland clique, just as a Cheshire clique came to Stockbridge by purchase.

Whitchurch was said in 1761 to be under the influence of the Townshend family, as to one seat, and the seventy burgage tenures were in fact owned by two men.[1] Throughout our three Parliaments the borough was represented by the Hon. H. G. P. Townshend, second son of the first Viscount Sydney, and by Sir Samuel Scott, second Baronet, whose father had been a banker in Westminster. This was the straightforward control very common in burgage boroughs.

Andover was a Corporation borough. In 1761 the Earl of Portsmouth exercised influence over one seat and left the Corporation a free choice for the other. The Earls of Portsmouth, whose surname was changed from Wallop to Fellowes in 1794, are said to have been landowners in the neighbourhood of Andover since before the Conquest. Their seat was Hurstbourne Park. One of the family, the Hon. Newton Fellowes, represented the borough in 1818; his place was taken in 1820 and 1826 by Sir J. W. Pollen, of Redenham, near Andover, whose family had provided the town with representatives in Parliament since the seventeenth century. The other seat, in all

---

1. Beauties of England, vol. 6. p. 236.

three years, was filled by another local landowner, Thomas Assheton Smith, of Tedworth, a famous cricketer and Master of Hounds.

In passing to the seaport towns we find, for good reasons, a naval touch about the representation. In Portsmouth there was no patron, unless it were the government; but the town was bound up with naval occupations, and favours could be obtained chiefly from the Admiralty and from officers high up in the service. So Portsmouth favoured government candidates and it favoured Admirals. One member in 1813 was Rear-Admiral Sir George Cockburn (afterwards for many years member for Plymouth), and his place was taken in 1820 by Admiral John Markham, son of William, Archbishop of York and Headmaster of Westminster. He was succeeded in 1826 by Francis Baring, afterwards third Baronet and first Lord Northbrook. The Barings were one of the most prominent of the family groups in the House of Commons throughout the century, and the two principal branches were seated in Hampshire, at Stratton Park (Lord Northbrook) and The Grange (Lord Ashburton). Their fortune had been made in banking. The other Portsmouth seat was filled in all three years by John Bonham Carter,[1] whose father had been Mayor of the town - and the Corporation was the electorate. The younger Carter, the M.P., inherited land from his cousins the Bonhams, whom we heard of at Petersfield. His seat was Ditcham Park.

Another kind of naval connection appears at Lymington. The Burrard family had been at Walhampton near that borough since 1668, and had provided it with M.P's since 1679. Many of the family had distinguished themselves in the army, but our member in 1818 and 1820, Sir Harry Burrard Neale, was an Admiral. The other members do not

---

1. V.C.H. Hants, iii, pp. 87, 204; Ann. Reg. (1838) Chron. p. 201; Gent Mag. N.S. ix, p. 429.

appear to be connected with the Burrard family or with the neighbourhood - George Finch (apparently an illegitimate son of the eighth Earl of Winchilsea), Walter Boyd, a banker, Williams Manning and Guy Prendergast.

Christchurch was the appanage of the Rose family [1], who were Lords of the Manor. Sir George Henry Rose was elected in all three years, and in 1826 he was joined by his son G.P. Rose, the other seat having been filled in the earlier years by William Sturges-Bourne, an intimate friend of Canning's.

The corporation of Winchester and the freemen of Southampton were less closely bound to particular families than any other of the electorates we have examined; they thus illustrate the difference between small and large boroughs. They showed none the less a marked preference for men of distinguished birth and usually of local connections. One member for Winchester in these three Parliaments was Paulet St. John Mildmay, who combined the inheritances of two of the families whose names he bore - the St. Johns of Farley and the Mildmays of Shawford, Hants, Hazelgrove, Somerset, and a great deal more in Essex. The principal seat was Dogmersfield Park, Hants, which had been acquired by marriage in 1703. Southampton, too, returned throughout these years a local squire, William Chamberlayne of Cranbury Park, Winchester, and Weston Grove, Southampton. The other member for Winchester in 1818 and 1830 was J. H. Leigh, and in 1826 Sir Edward Hyde East, born in Jamaica of an old settler family and himself a judge in India. Southampton in the first two Parliaments elected Sir William Champion de Crespigny, descendant of Huguenot refugees and landed

---

1. V. C. H. Hants. v. p. 86.

in Surrey, but it was a great naval family and so particularly eligible in a seaport town. Sir William's place was taken in 1826 by Abel Rouse Dottin[1], whose ancestors on both sides were connected with Barbados.

West Indian interests were thus represented at Southampton, Winchester and Stockbridge, and the navy at Portsmouth, Southampton and Lymington. The most distinct impression, however, is made by the group of landowning families, usually of the borough neighbourhood, who possessed an hereditary and more or less secure grip on the borough seats. Of the nine boroughs on the Hampshire mainland, all except Winchester, Southampton and Portsmouth were subject, in various degrees, to this sort of influence.

The Isle of Wight presents a curiously different picture. Of the three boroughs, only Newport survived the Reform Act. Newtown and Yarmouth were of insignificant dimensions. The whole island was said to be politically "controlled" in 1761 by Lord Holmes This influence was still apparent in 1818 and 1820, when Sir L. T. W. Holmes[2], ninth and last Baronet of Westover, I.W., was elected for Newport. His was another branch of the family, but his mother was a daughter of Lord Holmes. The remaining members for these boroughs show no connection with the island or even (except Sir Peter Pole) with Hampshire. Sir Peter Pole, elected for Yarmouth in 1820, was the second baronet of Wolverton, Hants, but was also a partner in the banking firm of Pole, Thornton and Co., which was dissolved in 1826 after the great crash. The other members came from all

---

1. Record of Old Westminsters, vol. i, p. 277.

2. Ann. Reg. (1825), Chron. p. 219; Greville, Memoirs, vol.i. p. 92 on 13.

quarters of the kingdom. Newport had Charles Duncombe (of Bucks and Yorkshire, afterwards first Lord Feversham), Canning the Prime Minister and the Hon. William Scott[1], son of Lord Stowell and nephew of Eldon - he hailed from Gloucestershire. Newtown had in all three years Hudson Gurney, of the Norfolk Quaker family, and for the other seat the Hon. G. A. Pelham (son of Lord Yarborough, of Lincolnshire), D. L. North (of Suffolk), and the Hon. C. C.Cavendish (of Bucks, but descended from the Dukes of Devonshire who belonged to Derbyshire). The members for Yarmouth were changed at every election: William Mount (of Berkshire, possessed of Wasing Place since 1760) and John Taylor in 1818; Sir Peter Pole, whom we know, and Sir Theodore Broadhead (a great landowner in Berkshire, Yorkshire and, through his wife, Shropshire) in 1820; and in 1826 Lord Binning (of Eastlothian, afterwards ninth Earl of Haddington) and Joseph Phillimore, of Shiplake, Oxfordshire, Regius Professor of Civil Law at Oxford and a pillar of the Grenville Party. Many eminent men, but all electorally birds of passage whom we would see, if we looked outside the Isle of Wight and for a longer period, flitting from one rotten borough to the next, till many at last found a haven in the Lords.

The example of Hampshire teaches us what to look for in other counties, and gives us a standard by which to measure their electoral condition. We shall expect to find many small boroughs more or less in the pockets of the great families of the neighbourhood; some where the voting power is controlled or owned outright by a magnate who might belong to another part of the country; others,

---

1. Lodge Peerage (1843). p. 571; Eton School Lists, p. 56.

probably more populous, where the corporation or the freemen exercise some freedom of choice, with a prejudice determined by the character of the local industry or the connection of some great family with the town. Still other boroughs will be put at the disposal of this or that politician as party exigencies at Westminster might require.

We noticed that in Hampshire the Corporation borough was the predominant type. In Shropshire the franchise was uniform in all five boroughs - it belonged to the freemen. The largest borough, Shrewsbury, was the only one showing any signs of independence, while Bishop's Castle was the only one disfranchised in 1832. The other three, Bridgnorth, Wenlock and Ludlow, were remarkable for their long-standing association with certain neighbouring families. The Whitmores of Apley Park represented Bridgnorth continuously from 1661 to 1870.[1] It is true that they were supposed to possess in 1761 influence over one of the seats only, and that the other was filled in 1818 by Sir T. J. Tyrwhitt Jones[2] of Stanley Hall, Bridgnorth, but the Whitmores held both seats after 1820. Thomas Whitmore, of Apley, was elected in all three years, and his kinsman William Wolryche-Whitmore, of Dudmaston, in 1820 and 1826. At Wenlock the Forester family was the chief power. In 1761 its influence extended to both seats, but in our period to one only, the other being subject to Lord Bradford. Thus Cecil Weld Forester, of Willey Park, was elected in 1818 and 1820, and was raised to the peerage in 1821. He was succeeded at Wenlock by his

---

1. Namier, op. cit., vol i, pp. 108-9

2. Gent. Mag., N. S. xii, pp. 649-50; Eton School Lists, p. 50.

brother Major Francis Forester, who was elected again in 1826. The other seat went in 1818 to the Hon. John Bridgeman Simpson, son of Lord Bradford; but in 1820 to Wl L. Childe, of Kinlet Hall, some ten miles from the borough, and in 1826 to P. B. Lawley-Thompson, afterwards Lord Wenlock, whose ancestors had been connected with the place in the Middle Ages, and had represented the county in the seventeenth century.

South-western Shropshire was the sphere of the great Herbert family and their Clive relations. The Earldom of Powis died out with the last Herbert of that branch in 1801; his sister had married the second Lord Clive, son of Clive of India, and the Earldom of Powis was re-created for him. The heir of this Earl changed his surname to Herbert, and the second son, who married the Baroness Windsor lengthened his to Windsor-Clive. The chief seat of the Earls was Powis Castle, in Montgomeryshire, but they were great lords in South-western Shropshire too, with a seat at Waldet Park. The younger branch got Oakley Park, outside Ludlow. We are not surprised to find that borough subject to the influence of these families. In 1761 the Earl of Powis controlled both seats. In our three Parliaments the members were Lord Clive (the Earl's heir) and his younger brother the Hon. R. H. Clive, of Oakley Park and husband of the Baroness Windsor. Bishop's Castle in 1813 elected their great-uncle William Clive. But his colleague John Robinson was an obscure person, and of the members in the other years, William Holmes[1] was the son of a wealthy brewer who entered society by buying land in County Sligo, and Edward Rogers[2] was the squire of Stanage Park,

---

1. Gent. Mag. N.S. xxxv, p. 315; Eton School Lists, p. 26.
2. Bagshaw, Directory of Shropshire (1851) p. 31.

Ludlow.

Of the members for Shrewsbury, Richard Lyster in 1819 does not appear to have belonged to a landed family, and the Hon. H. G. Bennet, son of the Earl of Tankerville, came from Northumberland. The force of attraction which local families exerted, even in a large borough, is illustrated by the other two members. Panton Corbett, of Longnor (1820 and 1826) bore a name conspicuous in Shropshire, though his father had not been a Corbett by birth. Robert Aglionby Slaney, of Walford Manor and Hutton Grange, was elected for the first time in 1826, and we shall encounter him again many years later.

The subjection of borough constituencies, and especially small ones, to local landowning dynasties is therefore even more noticeable in Shropshire than in Hampshire. In Buckinghamshire the power of such families was, if possible, even more firmly established, although of the six boroughs four (Aylesbury, Amersham, Wendover and Great Marlow) had potwalloper and scot and lot franchises, which in theory were completely democratic. Buckingham was a corporation and Wycombe a freemen borough.

Aylesbury had in the past been subject to official and commercial influence reaching out from London, which is another way of saying that the voters were exceedingly corrupt. Parliament attacked this corruption in the customary way in 1804 by extending the area of the borough to include the adjacent hundred. The larger the electorate, the more difficult to bribe. A large scot and lot electorate would be less amenable to the pecuniary arguments of the City, but more under the influence of the great powers of the neighbourhood. The great power in Buckinghamshire was the Grenville family, and it was represented at Aylesbury in all three years by

Lord Nugent, a son of the first Marquess of Buckingham. The other member, William Rickford, has not been identified, and may have been an example of the money-bag influence in the constituency.

The corporation borough of Buckingham was a Grenville borough pure and simple, and had been so in 1761. The members throughout our period were Field-Marshal Sir George Nugent and the Rt. Hon. Sir William Henry Fremantle - to give them their final titles. The Field-Marshal was an illegitimate scion of the Nugent family, into which the Marquess of Buckingham had married; and Sir William Fremantle was a faithful member of the Grenville party in Parliament, and son of a squire in the county. His nephew, Lord Cottesloe, married the Field-Marshal's daughter in 1824, thus forging a new link between the parliamentary colleagues themselves.

The other boroughs were all under the influence of local landowning patrons. Amersham belonged to the Tyrwhitt-Drakes as it had done in 1761. This family hailed originally from Devon, as might be expected, but it acquired its Buckinghamshire seat of Shardeloes by marriage about 1600. In our three parliaments Thomas Tyrwhitt-Drake and his brother William sat for Amersham. Both ended their parliamentary careers in 1832. Amersham was included in Schedule A of the Act.

At Wendover, another victim of the reforming axe, the patrons were the remarkable Abel Smith family. The first Abel Smith was a banker in Nottingham at the beginning of the eighteenth century. His son and namesake succeeded him there and was the father of a group of very successful men. The third son Robert became Lord Carrington. This branch, which was of Wycombe Abbey, was the only one connected with Buckinghamshire, but other branches

of the family joined it in the representation of Wendover. The son of Lord Carrington, Robert, who changed his surname to Carington was elected in 1818, and was succeeded in 1820 and 1826 by his uncle George Smith. Another uncle, Samuel Smith, sat in all three years. The power of this family was thus a new thing. The patrons in 1761 had been the Verneys of Warwickshire.

Lord Carrington lived at Wycombe Abbey, but he was not the patron of the borough of Wycombe. It was represented in our three parliaments by Sir John Dashwood-King, one of the Dashwoods of West Wycombe Park and son-in-law of T. H. Broadhead, member for Yarmouth, Isle of Wight. His colleague was Sir Thomas Baring, second baronet of Stratton Park, Hampshire. Sir Thomas' father had at one time been member for Wycombe, though the family does not seem to have had any territorial connection with the locality or relationship to the Dashwoods. Neither family appears to have been connected with the former Prime Minister the Earl of Shelburne (created also Lord Wycombe) or with R. Waller, who were patrons of the borough in 1761.

The remaining borough, Great Marlow, had close connections with local families. Pascoe Grenfell represented it from 1802 to 1820, so was one of the members elected in 1818. He came from Marazion, Cornwall, where his father was a merchant and acted as Consul for Holland. Pascoe acquired Taplow Court, near Marlow, and an influence in the borough. This influence was shared with the Williams family from Anglesey, which acquired Temple Court, Marlow, in 1788 and represented the borough from that time. Owen Williams, of the second generation, was elected in all our three years, and his son T. P. Williams joined him in 1820 and 1826.

We included in our selection two small counties with one

borough each, and we may now glance at those. At Huntingdon the freemen voted, and do not appear to have been tied down by long association with a particular family. John Calvert[1], of a family landed in Hertfordshire since the seventeenth century, was elected for Huntingdon in 1813, 1820 and 1826. The other member in 1820 was Lord Ancram, heir to the Marquess of Lothian, of Newbattle Abbey, Midlothian; and in 1826 James Stuart, whose family connection eludes us. Only in 1818 did one of the members represent the great territorial power in the county; the Hon. W. A. Montagu, son of the Earl of Sandwich.

Appleby, in Westmoreland, was a burgage borough, of which the patrons in 1761 were Sir J. Lowther (the great magnate of the county) and the Earl of Thanet, who owned Appleby Castle as well as a great deal of land in Kent and Yorkshire. The Hon. Henry Tufton, afterwards eleventh Earl of Thanet[2], sat for Appleby from 1826 to 1832. Otherwise Appleby showed no obvious connection with patrons. The membership changed completely at each election; and only George Pludyer (1818), son of a Lord Mayor of London, appears to have belonged to the neighbourhood by landownership. He was, moreover, father-in-law of Sir Philip Musgrave, the Cumberland baronet whom we saw elected at Petersfield. Thomas Creevey, the diarist, was returned in 1820, and Lord Maitland in 1826. In neither case does there appear to be any family connection with Westmoreland.

Here we take leave of the unreformed boroughs. Of the twenty-five considered, thirteen could be described as the appanages

---

1. V. C. H. Hertford, iv, p. 6.

2. Lodge, Peerage (1843), p. 521; Record of Old Westminsters vol. ii, p. 934.

of particular families - Stockbridge, Andover, Whitchurch, Petersfield, Christchurch, Bridgnorth, Wenlock, Ludlow, Buckingham, Amersham, Wendover, Wycombe and Great Marlow. In another three - Lymington, Bishop's Castle and Aylesbury - there was at least a strong connection with a local family, Burrard, Clive and Grenville respectively. In these sixteen boroughs the patrons belonged to the gentry more generally than to the nobility. One seat at Andover (Lord Portsmouth), one at Whitchurch (Lord Sydney), two at Ludlow and perhaps one at Bishop's Castle (Lord Powis), one at Wenlock (Lord Bradford) two at Buckingham (Lord Buckingham) and two at Wendover (Lord Carrington) were under the patronage of peers - ten seats in all, and we might add to these the shadowy influence of Lord Holmes in the Isle of Wight. In 1821 Mr. Forester of Wenlock was raised to the peerage, thus exemplifying the well-known fact of the unreformed period that boroughmongering could lead to the Lords. On the other hand eighteen seats in these sixteen boroughs were, in 1818, controlled by commoners. This proportion may not give a true picture of the position throughout England as a whole, but the influence of the peerage is not likely to be less than these figures suggest. We have not seen much of the immense influence of the ducal families. The head of the Grenvilles became Duke of Buckingham in 1822, and the Duke of Manchester had a little sphere of influence in Huntingdonshire, but a much more impressive show was made by the Dukes of Newcastle, Northumberland, Portland, Rutland, Devonshire, Bedford, Beaufort, Richmond, Grafton and even Norfolk, though his family was Catholic and its own members did not sit in either House till 1829. Even on the showing of the five counties we examined the power of the peers in

the choice of the lower House is remarkable enough, since one would imagine that the House of Lords provided them with at least adequate representation.

These examples have been drawn only from the boroughs. The influence of the aristocracy was distinctly greater in the counties, though manifested in a different form. There were no "pocket" counties, though some came very near to that description. The voters in counties were numerous and, in theory, independent. Winning a county election by corrupt means was ruinously expensive. But where a few great landowners dominated the county and were not opposed to one another their influence was very strong. County Society revolved about these people, and the lesser fry would not dare to be excluded from it; this kind of pressure percolated down from top to bottom of the electorate. But county society was divided into Whig and Tory sections, and if these cared to fight an election the weapon of social pressure could not be used effectively. Very often they called off the fight and divided the two seats between them. Sometimes one family and one party had the county to themselves, socially speaking, and that made political opposition most difficult.

Whichever of these conditions prevailed, the Knight of the Shire was a great dignitary who had the privilege of wearing spurs in the House and being treated with deference by citizens and burgesses. The county restricted its choice, in almost all cases, to landowners within its own borders; if a stranger were elected it could hardly be without the recommendation and assistance of a local magnate. The representatives might be scions of the great noble families, but even if they were not these families stood in

the background as the supreme social influence with which lesser people did well to connect themselves.

Hampshire was a large county with many great peers and ancient gentle families, so that no one or two of them could carry the elections unaided. Landed gentry represented the county: in 1812 W. J. Chute, whose family had the Vyne, near Basingstoke, since 1653, and Sir T. F. Heathcote, fourth baronet, of Hursley Park, Winchester. In 1820 it was G. Purefoy-Jervoise, of Herriard Park, which his family had acquired by marriage in 1601, and John Willis Fleming, who had succeeded his cousin at Stoneham Park, Southampton, the family estate since the seventeenth century. Fleming was elected again in 1826, in the company of Sir William Heathcote, fifth baronet.

A very similar picture appears in Shropshire. At the first two elections the members were Sir John Kynaston (afterwards Kynaston-Powell)[1], of Hardwick and Worthen, and John Cotes, of Woodcote, which had been in his family since the fifteenth century or earlier. In 1826 the Shropshire aristocracy intrudes in the person of Rowland Hill, afterwards Sir Rowland and second Viscount Hill, of Hawkstone Park. The other member was J. C. Pelham, a member of a Sussex family who had acquired Cound, Shropshire, apparently from a relation.

The aristocratic incubus is much more noticeable in Buckinghamshire, where the Grenvilles overshadowed all. One member for the county in all these years was Earl Temple, called later the Marquess of Chandos and in 1839 Duke of Buckingham and

1. Lodge, Peerage (1843), p. 607.

head of the family. His colleague in 1818 was William Selby-Lowndes of Whaddon Hall, but of a family seated at Winslow since the sixteenth century. His place was taken in 1820 and 1826 by the Hon. R. Smith (afterwards Carington), Lord Carrington's heir, whom we saw at Wendover in 1818.

As we turn to the smallest counties we find the great magnates ever more evident. The most notable family in Huntingdonshire was that of Montagu; the elder branch were Dukes of Manchester, and lived at Kimbolton Castle, and the younger, at Hinchinbroke House, were Earls of Sandwich. Lord Mandeville, heir to the Duke, was elected for the county in 1826, and his uncle Lord Frederick Montagu in 1818. In 1820 the seat went to an outsider, Lord John Russell, whose father the Duke of Bedford was the political boss of the adjoining county. The other Huntingdonshire seat was filled in all three years by W. H. Fellowes of Ramsey Abbey, a commoner but the most notable landowner in the county after the Montagus. His son became Lord De Ramsey.

For complete domination of a county we look to Westmoreland, which was in fact the possession of the Lowthers, Earls of Lonsdale. Lord Lowther, the heir, and his brother Henry were elected to all three Parliaments.

This completes a survey of sixty seats and their representatives in three Parliaments. We have seen what sort of men got into the House of Commons for particular places, and we have made the acquaintance of some very respectable families. We now ask what happened to these families and counties and boroughs after the blow of 1832 had fallen and the "great middle class" was admitted to power.

The reform of 1832 was twofold: an extension and rationalisation of the franchise and a redistribution of the seats.[1] Both tended to increase the influence of the urban middle class, but the Chandos Clause, giving the vote in counties to tenants-at-will, and the creation of new county seats combined to produce just the opposite effect. And the new franchise often made little practical difference to a smallish borough of the old scot and lot or sometimes even of a narrower category. The general result was, therefore: in the large industrial boroughs, now numerous, a new kind of representative; in the small boroughs remaining, little change; in the counties more seats for the same old families.

Of the counties in our list three had their representation increased. Hampshire was split into three divisions, two on the mainland with two members each, and the Isle of Wight with one. Shropshire was divided into North and South, each with two members, and Buckinghamshire, which remained undivided, had its representation increased to three. Since these constituencies were more under the thumb of the landowners than ever, they compensated in part for the loss of the rotten boroughs.

In the three larger counties there were many politically eligible families, and we would not necessarily expect to see in the county elections of 1857, 1859 and 1865 the same names as we

---

1. This was the redistribution in England and Wales:
Disfranchised, 56 boroughs (111 seats).
Lost one member, 30.
Weymouth and Melcombe Regis reduced from 4 members to 2.
New 2 member boroughs, 22 (44 seats)
New 1 member boroughs, 21.
New County seats, 65.
Total for England and Wales reduced by 13.

encountered in the earlier period. An examination of the lists shows nevertheless that the new members were of the same type as the old. The representatives of North Hampshire in all the later Parliaments were W. W. B. Beach, of Oakley Hall, Basingstoke, a member of the Wiltshire family of Hicks-Beach, and George Sclater,[1] afterwards Sclater-Booth, of Hoddington, Odiham. South Hampshire chose in all three years Sir J. C. Clarke-Jervoise of Idsworth Park, Horndean, a relation of G. Purefoy-Jervoise of Herriard Park whom we saw representing the county in 1820. His colleague in 1857 and 1859 was the Hon. R. H. Dutton of Timsbury Manor, Romsey, a son of Lord Sherborne. His place was taken in 1865 by Col. H. E. Hamlyn-Fane of Avon Tyrrell, Hants, a relation of the Earls of Westmorelam

The Isle of Wight, which before the Reform Act provided some quiet borough seats for politicians from all quarters, now chose landowners of the isle itself. In 1857 and 1859 the member was C. C. Clifford, whose father had been an Admiral, Black Rod, Baronet and landowner, establishing the family at Westfield House, Ryde. The island was represented in 1865 by Sir John Simeon, third baronet, whose father had married the heiress of the Barringtons of Swainston, an old island family.

In Shropshire we shall renew some old acquaintances. One member for the North in 1857 and 1859 was the Hon. R. C. Hill, afterwards third Viscount, of Hawkstone. He was joined in 1857 by J. W. Dod of Calverhall, near Prees. The other member in 1859 and 1865 was J. R. Ormsby-Gore, afterwards first Lord Harlech, who inherited the old Shropshire seat of Brogyntyn and the wealth of

---

1. Winchester College Register, p. 48.

three families. The remaining seat in 1865 was held by the Hon. C. H. Cust, of Arthingworth, Northamptonshire, but of a Lincolnshire family - an unusual example of foreign penetration.

South Shropshire had no such lapse. Lord Newport represented that division from 1842 to 1865, when he succeeded as third Earl of Bradford. We remember this family as the patrons of one of the Wenlock seats in earlier days. They were descended from the Newports who had been prominent in the county from the fourteenth century. They had a seat (Weston Park) near Shiffnal, though their main one was now Castle Bromwich in Staffordshire. Lord Newport's colleague was the Hon. R. Windsor-Clive, whose father had sat for Ludlow in all the earlier parliaments. These two gave place in 1865 to R. J. More, of Linley Hall and Larden Hall (his family had had both since the fifteenth century or earlier), and the Hon. Sir P. E. Herbert, a son of the second Earl of Powis and afterwards Lieutenant-General (Eighth Kaffir War, Crimea and Indian Mutiny). The representation of Shropshire was thus largely in the hands of the same families as in the previous generation, and altogether, we may say, of the same class and group of families.

In Buckinghamshire there were more changes. The Grenvilles had lost their influence. The county elected throughout the period a picturesque newcomer like Benjamin Disraeli, but in doing so was assuring the continuance of old ways more certainly than by choosing the heir of the Temple-Nugent-Brydges-Chandos-Grenvilles himself. Disraeli's colleagues were Caledon George Du Pré, of Wilton Park, Beaconsfield, and the Hon. W. G. Cavendish, of Latimer's, Chesham. The latter became second Lord Chesham. We saw his father elected at Newtown, Isle of Wight, in 1826. Lord Chesham went to

the upper House in 1863, and his place was taken by Sir R. B. Harvey, whose family had been at Langley Park, Slough, since 1788. Here were some names new to our list, and of only a couple of generations' connection with the county, or even less; but they all belonged unequivocally to the squirearchy or the nobility.

In the small counties there was less possibility of change. The chief families we saw in Huntingdonshire in the early parliaments were Montagu and Fellowes. In 1859 and 1865 the members were Edward Fellowes and Lord Robert Montagu. The former had been elected in 1857 also, when the other seat went to James Rust.[1] He was a little exceptional, for although he was a landowner in the county, he had acquired his seat, Alconbury House, as recently as 1840.

In Westmoreland we look for Lowthers, and find the Hon. H. C., who was sitting in the earlier parliaments, still there. The other member was the heir of a great Irish house - the Earl of Bective, afterwards Marquess of Headfort. That family belonged to County Meath, but this member of it married, in 1842, the heiress of Underley Hall, Kirkby Lonsdale, and thereby acquired his connection with Westmoreland.

The conclusion forced upon us by these examples is that the character of the county representation was in no way changed by the Reform Act. But the Act was not intended to change it. The participation of the middle class in politics was looked for only in the boroughs - the new boroughs, and the old boroughs with a new franchise. For new boroughs we shall have to look outside our

---

1. V.C.H. Huntingdon, iii, p. 6; Rugby School Register, Vol. i, p. 96.

group of counties. The only new one in that group was Kendal in Westmoreland. Stockbridge, Whitchurch, Newtown, Yarmouth, Bishop's Castle, Amersham, Wendover and Appleby were disfranchised. Petersfield and Christchurch each lost one seat. These disfranchised boroughs had in many cases been in the possession of patrons, some of whom now disappeared from the political scene (e.g. the Tyrwhitt-Drakes of Amersham). Some, like the Grosvenor patron of Stockbridge, who belonged to a powerful Cheshire family, had other strings to their bow. Others, politically more vigorous, successfully contested other boroughs of the neighbourhood and established a new connection. Thus the Abel Smiths had lost Wendover, but M. T. Smith, of this family, sat for Wycombe in 1857 and 1859, succeeded by the Hon. C. Carington in 1865, and S. G. Smith for Aylesbury in 1859 and 1865.

In the surviving boroughs the old connections were sometimes severed. We hear no more of Grenvilles at Buckingham or Aylesbury. The Roses were no longer at Christchurch, which elected Admiral J. E. Walcott. But there were few such changes. In all the other boroughs having family connections in the earlier period we find them again in the later. Andover elected the Hon. D. F. Fortescue, whose estates were in County Waterford and whose family belonged to Devon - but he was the son-in-law of the Earl of Portsmouth. Petersfield was represented by Sir. W. G. H. Jolliffe. G. C. W. Forester sat for Wenlock and H. Whitmore, in the first two parliaments, for Bridgnorth. Ludlow elected, at the same two elections, the Hon. P. E. Herbert, and when, as we have seen, he was chosen in 1865 for the southern division of the county, his place at Ludlow was taken by Captain the Hon. G. H. W. Windsor-Clive. In

1857 and 1859 Sir G. H. Dashwood sat for Wycombe and T. P. Williams for Marlow. The very same names, after the lapse of a generation and the passage of the Reform Act!

At the same time new names did appear. An interesting example is the election of Sir J. D. Acton (the historian) in H. Whitmore's place at Bridg north in 1865. The Actons had been at Aldenham Park, near Bridgnorth, for more than two centuries, but this branch was Catholic, and so ineligible to Parliament before 1829. And it may be significant that the new member (he had sat in the previous parliament for an Irish constituency) was an active member of several learned professions. He was a journalist and afterwards professor of history. Comparable with him in this respect was Beriah Botfield, P. E. Herbert's colleague at Ludlow, who not merely succeeded to his father's seat, Norton Hill in Northamptonshire, but established his own printing press there and entered the publishing business.

There were many other new names that belonged to old families and the old class. James Milnes Gaskell, the other member for Wenlock, was the owner of Wenlock Abbey, and descended from an old Lancashire and Yorkshire family. John Pritchard,[1] member for Bridgnorth, was of Stanmore in that neighbourhood. J. E. Severne, elected for Ludlow in 1865, was of Wallop Hall, near Shrewsbury, which his ancestors had had since the seventeenth century. One member for Buckingham was Sir Harry Verney, of Claydon House, Bucks, which his ancestors, though not in the direct line, had had since the fifteenth century. In the eighteenth

---

1. Ann. Reg. (1891), Chron., p. 178; Shrewsbury School Register, i, p. 18.

century they had been the patrons of the two Wendover seats. One member for Aylesbury was Sir. T. T. Bernard,[1] sixth baronet, who had the curious distinction of being educated at Westminster, Harrow and Eton.

The other representatives of these places were of a newer type, which has hitherto eluded us. J. G. Hubbard, afterwards first Lord Addington, was Governor of the Bank of England and head of the firm of Hubbard and Co., Russia Merchants. He acquired Addington Manor, near Buckingham, and was elected for that borough in 1859 and 1865. Sir Richard Bethell represented Aylesbury in 1857. His father had been a doctor in Bristol. The son became a knight, Member of Parliament, landowner (in Norfolk) and, in 1861, first Lord Westbury. Aylesbury in 1865 elected Sir, N. M. de Rothschild, afterwards Lord Rothschild, grandson of the founder of the English branch of the family and bank. His estate, Tring Park, was not in Bucks, but just over the border in Hertfordshire, where he had 10,000 acres. Another stranger from that county, J. R. Mills of Tolmers, represented Wycombe in 1865.

R. W. Kennard was elected at Newport, Isle of Wight, in 1859 and 1865. He was a merchant, and his father and brother were bankers. The same borough in 1857 was represented by Charles Buxton, a son of the philanthropist Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton. It was an Essex family, and Charles had estates in Surrey and County Kerry, but he began life as a partner in the brewing firm of Truman, Hanbury, Buxton and Co. - a sign of the times. Newport catered for wandering politicians in search of seats, as much in the

---

1. Record of Old Westminsters, vol. i, p. 82.

later period as in the earlier. Other members were P. L. Powys, landed in Oxfordshire and Middlesex, and Charles Wykeham-Martin of Leeds Castle, Kent.

The members for Lymington were a striking, though not novel, illustration of changing fortunes. The Mackinnons, Chiefs of the Clan Mackinnon, had migrated to Antigua and prospered there for some generations. Returning to Britain they acquired Belvedere and Acryse Park, in Kent. W. A. Mackinnon, junior, represented Lymington from 1857 to 1868. While his family had prospered in the West, his colleague was a product of the East Indies. General Carnac had been Commander-in-Chief in India, and his brother-in-law and heir, Sir James Rivett-Carnac, was also an ornament of the Honourable East India Company's service. His son, in turn, another Sir James, was Governor of Bombay, Chairman of the East India Company and first baronet. The second baronet, Sir John, was member for Lymington in 1857 and 1859. He was succeeded in 1865 by a stranger from Sussex, Lord G. C. H. Gordon-Lennox, son of the Duke of Richmond.

At one of the Andover seats a new kind of succession established itself. The seat was held from 1847 to 1861 by William Cubitt, of humble origin, proprietor of a great building firm, Alderman of the City of London and Lord Mayor from 1860 to 1862. He was followed at Andover by his son-in-law Sir William Humphrey, who was a son of another Lord Mayor of London.

It was perhaps appropriate that the only new borough in our list, Kendal in Westmoreland, should be represented from 1847 to 1868 by G. C. Glyn, afterwards first Lord Wolverton. His was an old and respectable family, related to the Glynnes of Hawarden,

but this branch was distinguished chiefly by its banking activities over a number of generations; the firm was Glyn, Mills and Co. This member's son G. G. Glyn, who was to be the second Lord Wolverton, was a contemporary of his father's in parliament, representing Shaftesbury from 1857 to 1873. The family had two country seats, Stanmore Park, Middlesex, and Iwerne Minster in Dorset.

The boroughs so far considered have been small ones. We noticed in the earlier years that the larger boroughs were less closely tied to particular families than the smaller. Yet even in them the electorate, pleased with the father, might be predisposed in favour of the son. We saw Winchester elect Sir E. H. East, who came from Jamaica and earned distinction in India. He represented the town from 1823 to 1830. He was immediately succeeded by his son Sir J. B. East, who sat for Winchester from 1830 to 1864, with one short break. The other member in the later period was John Bonham-Carter,[1] whose father had been M. P. for Portsmouth and his grandfather Mayor of that town.

Portsmouth in the later period showed no preference for admirals, which was perhaps a sign of increasing political morality. Sir. J. Dalrymple-Horn-Elphinstone, who came from Aberdeenshire, was no naval man; he was not related to the Admiral Elphinstone, Lord Keith, who took the Cape in 1795. The other member, Sir Francis Baring, was the same that we saw elected in 1826, from which year he represented the seaport continuously till 1865. He became Lord Northbrook in 1866. The two new members in 1865 were Serjeant Stephen Gaselee, a legal man and son of a judge, and W. H. Stone,

---

1. V. C. H. Hants, iii, pp. 87, 204; Winchester College Register, p.8.

a merchant, East Indian agent and director of the London and County Banking Co.

Winchester and Portsmouth illustrated both old affections and the rise of a new class; at Southampton the representation was more distinctly new-fangled. B. M. Willcox and W. D. Seymour figure in our "unknown" class, and George Moffatt, who purchased an estate in Herefordshire in 1870, had no landed connections before that. T. M. Weguelin[1] was a partner in Thomas, Bonar and Co. and Governor of the Bank of England, and his father had been a Russia merchant. If we add that the son was educated at Shrewsbury and acquired the estate of Billingbear Park, Wokingham, we shall see that he was a good example of the social process that has been described in this book. Another member, Russell Gurney, illustrated a different side of that process. His forebears had been yeomen and dissenters; his grandfather was a government short-hand writer; his father a K. C., Judge and knight who married the daughter of a doctor; and the son went to Trinity, Cambridge, was elected for Southampton in 1865 and supported the Conservative party.

One of the members for Shrewsbury till 1862 was R. A. Slaney, whom we first encountered there in 1826. The other, in all three of the later parliaments, was George Tomline, of a family landed in Suffolk and Lincolnshire, and so another of the few examples of the election of landowners without local connections. The vacant seat in 1865 was filled by a more typical representative of the times, W. J. Clement[2]. He was educated at Shrewsbury and

---

1. Ann.Reg.(1885), Chron., p. 155; Shrewsbury School Register, i, p.74.
2. Shrewsbury School Register, 1, p. 25.

then at three universities - Edinburgh, London and Paris - became a surgeon and then, presumably, a landowner in Merionethshire, as he was a Justice of the Peace and Deputy Lieutenant of that county.

We found no powerful connections at Huntingdon in the earlier period, nor were there apparently any in the 'fifties and 'sixties. But the members' names are very familiar to us. One was General Peel, younger brother of the Prime Minister Sir Robert, and so only the second generation of a family made by cotton. The other was Thomas Baring, son of Sir Francis (member for Portsmouth) and himself Chairman of Lloyd's from 1830 to 1868.

There is no difficulty in expressing in a summary form the state of borough representation in this period. Most small boroughs continued to elect members of neighbouring land-owning families with which they had had long associations. In some large boroughs there was occasionally a preference for an old member's son or for some great family of the county. Very rarely the scion of a great family got himself elected in a distant borough with which he had no more connection than, perhaps, the backing of the local party chiefs. But in the big boroughs, by and large, and a few small ones too, the characteristic feature is the appearance of newly-made men, banking directors, Russia merchants, Governors of the Bank of England, Lord Mayors, surgeons, sons of judges, bankers, cotton magnates, West Indian planters and East Indian nabobs.

Our list has not, however, included any of the very large towns that were newly enfranchised in 1832. We cannot

leave this subject without a glance at some at least of that group. The glance reveals the full significance of the Reform Act. Where we looked in the counties and small towns for the familiar names of local landed families, we think, in the great industrial towns, in terms of local industries and of the families made by them. Thus Stoke-on-Trent, the pottery town, elected to our first two parliaments W. T. Copeland, porcelain manufacturer, son of a porcelain manufacturer (a partner of Spode) and himself Lord Mayor of London. One member for Manchester in 1857 and 1859 was (Sir) Thomas Bazley, the biggest cotton magnate in Lancashire. Birmingham in 1857 chose G. F. Muntz, son of a metal manufacturer of Alsatian and ultimately Polish origin. At Oldham we are confronted with the firm of Hibbert, Platt and Sons, machinists. J. T. Hibbert, afterwards knighted, was the son of one of the founders, and was elected in 1865 with John Platt, son of the other founder. The latter, James Platt, had been elected in 1857. The Platts had land in Yorkshire, then in Lancashire and Caernarvonshire. Sir J. T. Hibbert acquired an estate at Grange-over-Sands.

Bradford stands for wool, and three or four miles away, on the river Aire, is the factory area of Saltaire, the creation of the Salt family. Sir Titus Salt, who built these works, was elected for Bradford in 1859.

A succession of members for Sunderland at these three elections presents a well-balanced economic picture. It begins with our old acquaintance George Hudson, the railway king, and Chairman of the Sunderland Dock Company. Next comes W. S. Lindsay, merchant and shipowner, founder of W. S. Lindsay and Co.,

and lastly James Hartley, proprietor of a Sunderland glass-making works (and subsequently, or rather consequently, squire of Ashbrooke, Co. Durham). Newcastle in 1865 elected Sir Joseph Cowen, whose family was connected with the town for several generations. It was founded by his father, a manufacturer of fire-bricks and gas-retorts, and when Sir Joseph died in 1873 his place in Parliament was filled by his son. One last example will be Sir Francis Crossley, carpet manufacturer and son of a carpet manufacturer, who represented Halifax till 1859.

Alongside the heads of great local industries were men of the same social and economic position, but connected with other industries or other towns. J. L. Ricardo, member for Stoke-on-Trent, was a financier and nephew of the economist. General T. P. Thompson, elected for Bradford in 1857, was the son of a merchant and banker of Hull. The great name at Leeds was Baines. Edward Baines was of humble origin, became a printer and journalist and ultimately proprietor of the Leeds Mercury. He represented Leeds in Parliament from 1834 to 1841. One of his sons, Sir Edward, became editor of the paper and an economist, and M. P. for the borough from 1859 to 1874. Another son, Matthew Talbot, had represented it from 1852 to 1859. A third, Thomas, was editor of the Liverpool Times. Many members for industrial towns belonged to this social class by birth, without being necessarily engaged in such occupations themselves. W. Scholefield (Birmingham) was the son of a banker and merchant, and W. Gray (Bolton) the son of a merchant

who came of a landowning family, and he himself was a Lieutenant-Colonel.

Nonconformity and the humbler learned professions appear prominently in this big town representation. Sir James Stansfeld, member for Halifax, was the son of a solicitor who became a County Court Judge and married the daughter of a Nonconformist minister. W. J. Fox (Oldham) was the son of a farmer who was a strict Calvinistic Independent. He became a Unitarian minister but was afterwards disowned by that Church. W. E. Forster (Bradford) the creator of the Education Act of 1870, was the son of a Quaker minister. John Bright, of the Anti-Corn Law League, was the son of another Quaker, a miller, and his mother was the daughter of a tradesman at Bolton. He represented Birmingham from 1857 onwards, and had previously sat for Manchester.

It must not be supposed, however, that the industrial boroughs in all cases spurned the advances of the well-born. Sometimes they welcomed such advances, even from strangers to the neighbourhood, if they were made in the right political spirit. Thus C. P. Villiers, of Lord Clarendon's family, and himself a landowner in Hertfordshire, rperesented Wolverhampton from 1835 to 1898 without a break. But he was a Benthamite Radical. Sir Charles Wood, whose family had been landed in Yorkshire since James 1, represented Halifax as a Liberal from 1832 to 1865, after which he went to the Upper House as Lord Halifax. Sir Frederick Peel, a son of the Prime Minister, and representative of Bury in 1859, had passed over to the Liberal

camp, unlike his uncle the General (member for Huntingdon) who was a hard-bitten Tory. T. E. Headlam, Liberal member for Newcastle-on-Tyne in all these parliaments, was a landowner in Yorkshire, but his father was an Archdeacon and his mother a clergyman's daughter.

Sometimes, on a swing of the pendulum, the Conservatives got some fox-hunting squire elected in a grimy urban constituency. Stoke-on-Trent in 1866 returned A. J. B. Beresford-Hope, of Bedgebury Park, Kent. His grandfather had been one of the Hopes of Amsterdam, bankers, who however were of English origin - so international is high finance. His colleague at Stoke was H. R. Grenfell, a director of the Bank of England and one of the Grenfells of Great Marlow, Bucks, who had formerly been conspicuous in the representation of that place. Sir Frederick Peel's opponent at Bury, who was elected in 1857 and again in 1865, was R. N. Philips, of a family landed in Lancashire and Warwickshire. Tynemouth also showed some favour to local landowners, choosing in 1859 Hugh Taylor, of Chipchase Castle, Northumberland. He was succeeded in 1865 by Sir George Otto Trevelyan, the historian. The Trevelyan family was, of course, of Cornish origin; it got Nettlecombe Court, Somerset, in the sixteenth century and a baronetcy in 1662. The Northumberland family was a younger branch, founded by Sir Charles, first baronet, who married Lord Macaulay's sister and was father of Sir George. Wallington was their seat.

In spite of these gentlemen, it seems possible to make the generalisation that industrial towns showed as marked a

preference for industrialists and financiers, local or distant, as the small boroughs showed for the local squirearchy with which they had old connections. We conclude from this that the franchise reform of 1832 was less significant than the redistribution of seats. It was mainly the new boroughs that opened Parliament to the men made by the new industries, though many of the old ones were captured by new landed families of the same origin, and all made the acquaintance of old aristocrats and squires who had got entangled in the new fabric of industry and finance.

It may now be asked, what light would be thrown on the rôle of the Public Schools by a similar particular examination? The selection of examples to illustrate this question cannot coincide with the selection used in the foregoing study. We should be overwhelmed by the flood of young swells, some at Eton, some employing private tutors, others of whose education we know nothing. But the whole would add little to the knowledge we have already gained from the statistics in our tables. It is of little interest to know which particular Clive or Whitmore was at Eton, or which young gentlemen of Hampshire give us no clue to their schooling.

Instead, we look for illustrations of each educational phenomenon treated in former chapters. We should like to see something of the men who were taught at home, or sent to sea in their boyhood; what successful business men did with their sons; what "other English schools" had produced members of Parliament; where men of humble origin had been taught.

The large numbers which the statistics show to have been educated otherwise than at Public Schools present a great variety of examples. In the highest classes the private tutor was an important institution, whose presence we can often guess even when not specifically mentioned. The Marquess of Titchfield, who would have been fifth Duke of Portland if he had survived his father, received "a domestic education under the ablest instructors" after which he was entered at Christ Church, Oxford. When, therefore, we find no reference to the schooling of the fifth Duke of Grafton (afterwards at Trinity, Cambridge), while his next brother, Lord Charles Fitzroy, was sent to Harrow, we are not likely to be wrong in supposing that he, too, was taught by able instructors at home. This was commonly the fate of Dukes at the beginning of the century, and was quite usual among the upper classes generally. The same institution was found in wealthy middle class families, and the case of John Stuart Mill, who almost miraculously survived his father's cramming, could be paralleled in less startling forms by many boys brought up by clever elder brothers or uncles who professed the law or the service of the Church.

In the transitional and humbler classes, however, a domestic or otherwise obscure education was usually only preliminary to a practical introduction to the business of life, in the shape of apprenticeship to a trade, participation in the family business, or further schooling in the navy - a democratic service. Even in the higher classes, boys destined for the navy or, in some cases, the army, entered those lines of life at an

age when other boys had scarcely begun at their Public Schools.

Sir William Curtis, Lord Mayor of London and Member for that city, was the son of a biscuit manufacturer, and all we know of his education was that he was "bred to business". Charles Gilpin, son of a Quaker merchant at Bristol, was "brought up to trade", and in due course was elected for Northampton. William Haldimand, member for Ipswich, son of a merchant but grand-nephew of a Governor of Canada, received "a plain English education" and then entered his father's counting-house. In a higher rank Sir David Salomons, whose father was a London merchant but also a landowner, was "brought up to commercial life". Still higher stood Alexander Baring, first Lord Ashburton, whose father was a banker and landowner. The son appears to have received a longer preliminary education, though nothing is said about it; and then, "as soon as he had attained the age when he could be launched into the world, he was, according to the excellent practice of the commercial men of London, induced into the pursuits he was afterwards to elevate, by a course of hard and active servitude as a subordinate"[1]. Sometimes schools are specified as preceding this hard initiation. Sir John Rolt, a dissenter, son of a Calcutta merchant, went to some private schools at Chipping Norton and Islington and was then apprenticed to a woollendraper. He became a Judge and Conservative member for Western Gloucestershire. Sir Francis Crossley, whom we have encountered as member for Halifax, had a

---

1. Gent Mag., N. S. XXX, p. 89.

schooling in that town and then "entered his father's business at an early age".[1]

The Navy caught men young. Admiral Sir David Milne, son of a merchant, entered that service at fifteen. The Hon. Arthur Duncombe took the plunge at thirteen, and so did the Hon. C.R.D.Hanbury-Tracy, afterwards fourth Lord Sudeley, and Sir Charles Napier, a distinguished admiral. Sir Frederick Thesiger, afterwards Lord Chelmsford, went through an interesting sequence. His father was a collector of Customs at St. Vincent; the son went to a private school, Dr. Charles Burney's at Greenwich, and then "entered the navy at an early age"; he deserted the navy for the bar and the woolsack; and his son, mistakenly choosing a military career, earned notoriety at Isandhlwana. The senior service was often no more than a phase in a man's career. We heard of William Cubitt as member for Andover, Lord Mayor of London, and head of a building firm. He had been four years in the navy before learning building from his brother. Sir James Duke was brought up to a naval career, but ended as Sheriff, Lord Mayor and M.P. for London.

Many - but they were all patricians - joined the army at a similarly early age. Lord W.H.Cavendish-Bentinck did so at sixteen; (the Hon.) Sir H.G.P.Townshend at fifteen; J.T.Vane at sixteen. In those corrupt days a commission in either service was, of course, no guarantee that the gallant young officer had ever left his own fireside; commissions might be nothing more than a way of getting an unearned emolument. But we do not find

---

1. Men of the Time (1868), p. 216.

anyone at a Public School at the same time as he was drawing an ensign's pay. The commission, even if a sinecure, seems to have excluded that possibility. And in the navy at least it was common for young men to round off their professional education in the service itself.

Outside the landowning class, a good many members of Parliament were products of private and the lesser grammar schools. These, and the people who attended them, may be exemplified. The Brown family emigrated to Maryland and took to the linen trade; they returned and conducted that trade, as well as banking, in Liverpool - the firm was Brown, Shipley and Co. One member of the family, Sir William Brown, was representative of South Lancashire and supporter of the Anti-Corn-Law League. He had been educated "under the Rev. J.Bradley" of Catterick, Yorkshire. George Spence, was sent by his father, a surgeon, to a private school at Richmond (Surrey) and then to the University of Glasgow. Robert Stephenson, railway engineer, and son of George, more famous railway engineer, was educated at the vill age school, Long Benton, and then at Bruce's Academy in Newcastle. Others were the product of endowed grammar schools. Sir John Mellor, son of the Mayor of Leicester, passed through Leicester Grammar School and then, after further tuition by Charles Barry, Unitarian minister of that town, went to University College, London. Sir J.J.Guest, whose father founded the iron works at Dowlais, Glamorganshire, was sent to the grammar schools of Bridgnorth and Monmouth. Many boys were sent to small Nonconformist schools for religious reasons. James Wilson, son of a woollen manufacturer, went to Quaker schools at Ackworth and Earlh

Colne.

The same types of education are found in many of the families we have classed as transitional. Certain private schools, earning a reputation while some able master presided, were favoured in each generation. J.C.Herries ("from Herrieses and schisms, good Lord, deliver us"), son of a merchant, went to the private school at Cheam and then to Leipzig University. Sir Fitzroy Kelly, whose father was a Captain, R.N., and whose maternal grandfather was Carver and Cupbearer to George III, was sent to Mr. Farrer's school in Chelsea. Disraeli proceeded from Miss Roper's, Islington, via Mr. Potticany's, Blackheath, to Mr. Cogan's, Epping Forest. Thomas Creevey, the diarist who is not in the Dictionary of National Biography, was educated at Newcome's School, Hackney. He was the "reputed son" of a Liverpool merchant, but may really have been the illegitimate son of the Earl of Sefton. The grammar schools were naturally patronised by the transitional class, as witness, for instance, General T.P.Thompson, son of a merchant and banker of Hull, and alumnus of Hull Grammar School and Queens' College, Cambridge; or Sir John Williams, of Manchester Grammar School and Trinity, Cambridge, son of a clergyman; or Sir Thomas Bazley, of Bolton Grammar School, the cotton magnate and son of a mathematician and "literary man".

There have been examples of patricians taught at home, of plebeians brought up to trade or educated at private and small grammar schools. In all classes the tendency was away from these paths and towards the Public Schools. This tendency was most

important in the upper class, which set the fashion for others to follow, and it is easy to trace by following the careers of several generations in the same family. We may begin with names already familiar to us. For Sir. T.F.Heathcote, fourth baronet, the Gentleman's Magazine gives us no reference.[1] Sir William, fifth baronet, was of Winchester and Oriel. Sir Thomas Baring, second baronet, was in the no reference class, but his son, the first Lord Northbrook, was of Winchester and Christ Church. The founder of the Calcraft family, was an eighteenth century army contractor who bought land. To his son John's education we have no reference.[2] But the latter's son, John Hales Calcraft, was an Etonian. We saw that the fifth Duke of Grafton must have been taught at home; the sixth Duke was at Harrow.[3] As a last example: the second Earl of Harrowby was educated privately and then at Christ Church; the third Earl was at Harrow and Christ Church.

The same development may be noticed in families of the transitional class, but for a different reason: the earlier generation had not yet made its money or established its position, but when success had been attained the next generation was given the advantage of the Public School. Sir Edward East, whom we met as an Indian judge of West Indian origin, and as member for Winchester in 1826, was placed in the no reference class for education.[4] But he sent his son, Sir James East (also member

1.1825, vol. i, p. 273.
2.Gent Mag., 1831, vol. ii, pp.465-6; and D.N.B., viii, p.237.
3.Ann.Reg., 1882, Chron.p.130. (Not mentioned in Harrow School Register).
4.D.N.B., xvi, p.325; Gent.Mag., N.S. xxvii, pp.422-3.

for Winchester) to Harrow and Christ Church. The Bass family brewed beer at Burton-on-Trent. The grandson of the original brewer was H. T. Bass, who was the first of the family to become a landowner. He was sent to Burton Grammar School and Nottingham, but his son Michael, first baronet and first Lord Burton, went to Harrow and Trinity, Cambridge.

Sir Thomas Potter was Mayor of Manchester, and sent his son T. B. Potter to Rugby and the University of London. A variety of social types can be found among the families which, on making a success of business or profession, entered their sons at Public Schools. These families were not always newcomers to Society. Sometimes they were younger branches which the Church or the colonial service had provided for, and which were thus able to give their sons an educational opportunity of retaining a place in the upper class. The Rt. Hon. Thomas Milner-Gibson was the son of a Major stationed in Trinidad, who in turn was the son of a clergyman. Thomas began his education as a schoolfellow of Disraeli at Mr. Potticany's, Blackheath. From there he went to Charterhouse, and then, after a spell with a tutor, to Trinity, Cambridge. M.H. Marsh was the son of a Canon of Salisbury, and his maternal grandfather was another clergyman. He went to Westminster and Christ Church, made a fortune in New South Wales and returned to represent Salisbury in Parliament.[1] C. M. Ricketts was the son of a Governor of Barbados, and his

---

1. Record of Old Westminsters, vol.ii, p. 624.

mother's father was a Governor of Fort William, Bengal. He, too, went to Westminster,[1] had a career in India and in British politics and became a Fellow of the Royal Society.

Ralph Bernal was a social lion and collector of objets d'art early in the century. His son and namesake, who after his marriage with a baronet's heiress became Ralph Bernal Osborne, had been educated at Charterhouse and Trinity, Cambridge. At Winchester, as at Charterhouse, our statistics would lead us to expect the sons of merchants and other flourishing middle class men. James Clay is an example of that class; Edward Cardwell, the reformer of the army, is another. We saw Sir William Humphrey (whose father and father-in-law were both Lord Mayors of London) as member for Andover. He had been at Winchester and at Wadham, Oxford. Another Hampshire member, Stephen Gaselee (M.P. Portsmouth), son of a judge, had been to Winchester and Balliol. A member of the Ellice family had emigrated to America in 1766. He returned to become an American and West Indian merchant in London, and an advocate in Scotland. He sent his son, the Rt. Hon. Edward Ellice, to Winchester and to Marischal College, Aberdeen. Another Wykehamist was Sir. C. E. Carrington, whose father had been a colonial planter and his mother the daughter of a clergyman.

The Dilke family was of ancient respectability but had fallen on evil days. Charles Wentworth Dilke, proprietor and editor of the Athenaeum, married the daughter of an Indian Civil

---

1. Ibid., vol. ii, p. 786.

Servant and revived the position of the family, sending his son and namesake, the first baronet, to Westminster and Trinity Hall, Cambridge. It was the second baronet who brought some notoriety upon the family name many years later. Another Westminster was Michael Angelo Taylor, son of the architect Sir Robert Taylor; and still another was the poet Southey, son of a Bristol linendraper who married an attorney's daughter. Southey was returned for Downton in 1826 but was afterwards disqualified for not having the requisite landed property.

The best educational entrée to Society was, of course, provided by Eton, and members of the transitional class would do well to send their sons there if they could. We might expect only those who had already achieved much wealth and social distinction to do so, but Eton was in fact available to the sons of men wholly devoted to business. There were, on the one hand, many Etonians of semi-patrician origin like Sir Lancelot Shadwell, whose father was a barrister and whose mother was related to the Whitmores of Shropshire; or Sir Charles Selwyn, younger brother of the Bishop of New Zealand. Their father was a barrister, and son of a K.C. Their mother was the daughter of a landowner. But you would find a distinctly bourgeois class at Eton too. Walter Morrison, of Eton and Balliol, and member for Plymouth, was a son of James Morrison of Morrison, Dillon and Co., and his mother was a daughter of another member of that firm. Samuel Jones Loyd, first Lord Overstone, the very rich banker, was of Eton and Trinity, Cambridge. His father was a Welsh dissenting minister who became a banker and married the daughter of a banker. Henry

Warburton[1] was the son of a London merchant. Eton and Trinity, Cambridge, led him ultimately to a fellowship of the Royal Society. The list of Etonians may approximately be closed with Gladstone himself, whose father was a merchant of Scottish middle class origin.

We have here illustrated the phenomena with which we were concerned in earlier chapters, and, it may be hoped, covered the dry bones with a little flesh and blood. The avenues of admission to the House of Commons, the effect of the Reform Act on these, the types of education enjoyed at different levels of society during two or three generations, have thus been exemplified. The examples have confirmed the impression made earlier by the statistics and the generalisations which they suggested.

---

1. Gent. Mag., 3rd Ser:, vol. v, pp. 531-2.

C H A P T E R VII.

FROM FACT TO FICTION.

Truth is stranger than fiction, because it need not stoop to be convincing. Fiction must never represent anything so odd as to appear improbable; it should, therefore, offer such pictures of manners and society as will be recognised by contemporary readers. The novel ought to be as much superior to the true story, in its value for the social historian, as a painting is superior to a photograph in showing the character behind a face.

But this analogy is not altogether exact. The painter has the whole of his subject seated in his studio. The social novelist cannot possibly be acquainted with all the parts of contemporary society. He sees it from a particular standpoint. One section of society will be seen by him from the inside; others only from the outside, or even from a distance. An infinite variety of fiction, written by people drawn from every social rank, would give us a picture of social stratification and class relationships that could hardly be improved upon. When we number our novels only by the half-dozen, we must accept each with reserve and a cautious glance at the status, experience and prejudices of the author.

For this reason fiction was not included in the ordinary evidence on which the previous chapters have been based. From a judicious selection of a dozen classics it might be possible to prove or disprove almost any statement in this book. Instead, we collect our novels at the end and do not treat them quite as if their authors had been sworn in the witness-box. The question is, does the fiction of the nineteenth century bear out the main contentions

that we have advanced? The answer will be that it does, in the main, but, since a novel treats of social and personal relationships in minute detail, it will inevitably show irregularities in our hitherto rather rough cartoon of straight lines and sweeping curves.

The novelists of use to us will be those who describe fashionable society, and others who introduce us to the ambitious and successful bourgeoisie, and most of all those who can show us the meeting-point of the two. We turn up our genteel noses at Dickens as we would at Hogarth. We rely, in the early stages, upon Maria Edgeworth and Jane Austen. As the period advances we turn to Disraeli, Charlotte Brontë, Trollope, Tom Hughes and, above all, Thackeray.

The witnesses are not all equally reliable, and we cannot give the same credit to all the parts of anyone's evidence. Some novels purport to deal with the period in which they were written, others with a period earlier in the author's life, or even too early for him to have known by direct experience. Thus Shirley was published in 1849, but it is a story of the years just before Waterloo, and Charlotte Brontë, who wrote it, was born in 1816. Thackeray's works usually bring a generation from childhood to maturity, and we cannot be sure that the writer was careful to distinguish between the social conditions of the twenties or of 1815 (in the first chapter) and those of the thirties or forties (in the last). As he was the merciless critic of snobbery, insincerity and hypocrisy, he may possibly have projected backwards to the year of Waterloo some of the social peculiarities of the time when Vanity Fair and Pendennis were published. It would therefore be a reasonable precaution to regard all the novels as pictures of the

times in which they were written, with special treatment for any that were frankly intended for an earlier day.

Let us see how this fiction may illustrate, in turn, each of the propositions we have put forward in the preceding chapters.

Maria Edgeworth sent Patronage to the press in 1813, and it is said to have been based on a story told to her by her father many years earlier. We should not go far wrong in saying that it described society in the period of the wars. The same may be said of Pride and Prejudice, which Jane Austen first wrote in 1796-7, and finally published in 1813. How does genteel society appear to these accomplished ladies?[1]

Patronage is a very moral story; not one member of the egregious Percy family makes a single mistake, or swerves by a hair's breadth from the course of irreproachable discretion and wisdom, in the whole 785 pages; and this virtue is amply rewarded before the end. We cannot be quite sure that the social attitudes of the Percys are those of their real flesh-and-blood contemporaries, since they might be rather the product of eighteenth century ideas on the perfectibility of man. Nor are we quite sure that the social ostracism that was their punishment for losing their estates was not a little overdone to point the moral of the story. But even with these reservations the book is very useful to our purpose.

The milieu in which the story is set is that of the landowning class. The principal characters lived at Percy Hall, or Falconer Court, or Hungerford Castle, or Clermont Park. And they had the usual contacts with the professional and commercial classes -

---

1. It will not be necessary, in quoting novels, to give chapter or verse, volume or page.

younger sons in the professions, daughters courted by rich landowners whose fathers had made their money in commerce or in India. We are interested in the attitude of various characters to these contacts.

The social fact that makes the deepest impression is the importance attached to money as a qualification for marriage. "Pretty well married, you know", said Lady Jane Granville, "implies £2,000 a year; and very well married, nothing under £10,000". The love-match was a snare and a delusion which might deflect youth from the path of prudence. So Lady Jane continued with the earnest advice "not to puff up Caroline's imagination with a parcel of romantic notions. - I never yet knew any good done by it". Men as well as women married for money. Sir James Harcourt, whose fortune had been ruined in two county elections, "dangled year after year at court, living upon the hope and promise of a pension or a place, till his creditors warning him that they could wait no longer, he had fallen in love with Lady Angelica Headingham". She had a more eligible admirer in Mr. Barclay, a man of considerable fortune as well as good family.

When Caroline Percy was introduced to London society, the standards of value prevailing in that exalted world were soon made apparent to her.

"On her first entrance into a public room eyes turned upon her - the eyes of mothers with apprehension, of daughters with envy. Some gentlemen looked with admiration, others with curiosity.

" 'A new face! Who is she?'

" 'A relation of Lady Jane Granville'.

" 'What has she?'

" 'I don't know - nothing, I believe'

" 'Nothing, certainly - a daughter of the Percy who lost his fortune'.

" All apprehensions ceased on the part of the ladies, and generally all admiration on the part of the gentlemen. Opera-glasses turned another way. Pity succeeding to envy, a few charitably disposed added, 'Ah! poor thing! unprovided for - what a pity!'

" 'Do you dance to-night?'

" 'Does our quadrille come next?'

"Some gentleman, an abstract admirer of beauty, perhaps, asked the honour of her hand - to dance; but there the abstraction generally ended. A few, indeed, went farther, and swore that she was a fine girl, prophesied that she would take, and declared they would be d___d if they would not think of her, if they could afford it"

If they could afford it!. A man - or a woman - who was rich enough might rise above these sordid calculations. That so few did rise above them must be evidence that the cost of living in good society was more than the average gentleman's income could meet. It was the hard lot of well-born people, even so long ago as that, to feel obliged to keep up a style more costly than they could afford. Their resource was the base diplomacy of the marriage market.

Under these circumstances it is not surprising that coin of the realm covered a multitude of genealogical and heraldic sins. Mrs. Falconer was an arch-schemer for her daughters. After aiming too high she was reduced, in the disposal of Georgiana, to the alternatives of young Petcalf and "English" Clay. Petcalf's father the general had a convenient lodge and had made a fortune in India, but Mr. Clay had Clay Hall and seven thousand a year, bequeathed by

a father who had flourished in commerce. It is worth noting, too, that this father's brother was a Bishop. Clay was the better match, Petcalf only a pis aller held in reserve. A marriage with Georgiana would appeal to such suitors on account of her respectable birth. Clay spent his money "in all kinds of extravagance and profligacy, not from inclination, but merely to purchase admission into fine company".

Mr. Barclay, with his Leicestershire estates, and Mr. Gresham the City magnate, might seek the hands of the impoverished Percy girls; but Mr. Temple, poor though of good family, wished he had kept to the study of the law, by which he might have made four thousand a year and "have married any woman in any rank" - meaning in particular the portionless Rosamond Percy. Now this Temple, younger son of a younger son, was temporarily discouraged by Rosamond, who loved him, on the generous ground that she would not ruin her lover's fortune by becoming an additional burden upon it. He was, indeed, too poor to marry. He had a mere five hundred a year, and had just been promoted from the office of private secretary to the Prime Minister to that of envoy to a German court. The principle is implied, though not stated, that men do not marry on the strength of the salary of an office, since offices are insecure. A professional income would be a better bait for a bride, because it is "independent of any man".

The professions were, in themselves, not lacking in prestige and social opportunities. Alfred Percy followed the law, was treated at first with the respect due to his birth, and afterwards with the deference that was appropriate to his success and his income. That he should marry the poorly dowered Miss Leicester,

niece of a clergyman, was a sign of his financial independence and lofty judgement rather than of a low social standing. (Contrary to expectation, Sophia Leicester was left only a moderate fortune, which mishap deprived her of some of her fashionable admirers). His brother Erasmus studied medicine and through professional skill - though only after a virtuous and exemplary struggle - established for himself an assured place in society.

In the professions everything depended on success. Sir Amyas Courtney was a fashionable physician, "certainly the prettiest behaved physician breathing, with the sweetest assortment of little-tattle, with an inexhaustible fund of anecdotes and compliments for the great, and an intimate acquaintance with the fair and fashionable". Dr. Frumpton, on the other hand, began as a farrier, became a quack, then succeeded in getting a medical diploma and an extensive practice, but did not lose the impress of his vulgar origin.

Attorneys, of course - "by-the-bye, pray tell Rosamond in answer to her question whether there is an honest attorney, that there are no such things as attorneys now in England - they are all turned into solicitors and agents, just as every shop is a warehouse, and every service a situation." But, to resume, attorneys did not enjoy the same status as barristers. Sharpe was the wicked attorney whose cunning was always employed in bad causes, and his social position is maliciously affected in the story by making Lydia Sharpe, his kinswoman, a lady's maid.

As the title of the novel suggests, it is much concerned with other and less independent ways of providing for younger sons. The Falconer family represents the principle of procuring jobs by

toadying to the great men in office, and scurrying over to the other party when a change of government is imminent. The offices thus obtained - those of commissioners, private secretaries, diplomatic envoys - would hardly be accessible to people not already having some place in society. We do not, therefore, learn what social status, if any, inhered in the offices themselves. The Falconers deserved the opprobrium heaped upon them for moral, not social reasons.

Let us consider more closely the case of the merchants. We are introduced to the Amsterdam firm of Grinderweld, Groensvelt and Slidderschild, and their London correspondents Panton and Co. Panton and Gresham are the partners in this latter firm. Panton is a man of low birth, vulgar manners and coarse mind. His first wife was of good family and breeding, sacrificed in marriage to him for his money. Their daughter Constance inherited her mother's traits. The second Mrs. Panton was "a huge, protuberant woman, with a full-blown face, a bay wig, and artificial flowers; talking in an affected little voice when she is in company, and when she has on her company clothes and manners; but bawling loud, in a vulgarly broad cockney dialect, when she is at ease in her own house." These Pantons lived in Grosvenor Square. The father left his fortune to Constance on the condition that, within twelve months of his death, she married someone not lower in rank than the son of a baron.

Gresham presented a sharp contrast to his partner. He lived in the City - "the wrong end of the town" - but was surrounded there by a great collection of pictures and books. His cultivated mind made one forget his bourgeois origin. He got to

know the Percys and he proposed to Rosamond. Her rejection of him was preceded by a family discussion which must be amply quoted, with the caution that the opinions expressed were not necessarily those of society in general.

" 'True - very true', said Rosamond, smiling; 'generosity might make a hero of him if he were not a merchant - a merchant! - a Percy ought not to marry a merchant.'

" 'Perhaps, my dear,' said Mrs. Percy, 'you don't know that half, at least, of all the nobility in England have married into the families of merchants; therefore, in the opinion of half the nobility of England, there can be nothing discreditable or derogatory in such an alliance.'

" 'I know, Ma'am, such things are; but then you will allow they are usually done for money, and that makes the matter worse. If the sons of noble families marry the daughters of mercantile houses, it is merely to repair the family fortune. But a nobleman has great privileges. If he marry beneath himself, his low wife is immediately raised by her wedding-ring to an equality with the high and mighty husband - her name is forgotten in her title - her vulgar relations are left in convenient obscurity: the husband never thinks of taking any notice of them; and the wife, of course, may let it alone if she pleases. But a woman, in our rank of life, must bear her husband's name, and must also bear all his relations, be they ever so vulgar. Now, Caroline, honestly - how should you like this?'

....."Fortunately, my dear Rosamond, you are not called upon for any such effort of philosophy, for Mr. Gresham is not vulgar, nor is even his name vulgar, and he cannot have any vulgar

relations, because he has no relations of any description - I heard him say, the other day, that he was an isolated being.'

" 'That is a comfort', said Rosamond, laughing; 'that is a great thing in his favour; but if he has not relations, he has connexions. What do you think of those horrible Pantons? This instant I think I see old Panton cooling himself - wig pushed back - waistcoat unbuttoned - and protuberant Mrs. Panton with her bay wig and artificial flowers. And not the Pantons only, but you may be sure there are hordes of St. Mary Axe cockneys, that would pour forth upon Mrs. Gresham with overwhelming force, and with partnership and old-acquaintance-sake claims upon her public notice and private intimacy.....My mother is the most indulgent of mothers, and, besides, the most candid, and therefore I know she will confess to me that she herself cherishes a little darling prejudice in favour of birth and family, a leetle prejudice - well covered by good-nature and politeness - but still a secret antipathy to low-born people.'

" 'To low-bred people, I grant.'

" 'Oh! mother! you are upon your candour - my dear mother, not only low-bred, but low-born: confess you have a - what shall I call it? - an indisposition towards low-born people.'

" 'Since you put me upon my candour', said Mrs. Percy, 'I am afraid I must confess that I am conscious of a little of the aristocratic weakness you impute to me.....And lest your imagination should deceive you as to the extent of my aristocratic prejudices, let me explain. The indisposition, which I have acknowledged I feel towards low-born people, arises, I believe, chiefly from my taking it for granted that they cannot be thoroughly

well-bred. I have accidentally seen examples of people of inferior birth, who, though they had risen to high station, and though they had acquired, in a certain degree, polite manners, and had been metamorphosed by fashion, to all outward appearance, into perfect gentry, yet betrayed some marks of their origin, or of their early education, whenever their passions or their interests were touched: then some awkward gesture, some vulgar expression, some mean or mercenary sentiment, some habitual contraction of mind, recurred.....I ought to observe, that merchants are now quite in a different class from what they were at the first rise of commerce in these countries', continued her mother. 'Their education, their habits of thinking, knowledge, and manners, are improved, and, consequently, their consideration, their rank in society, is raised. In our days, some of the best informed, most liberal, and most respectable men in the British dominions are merchants. I could not, therefore, object to my daughter's marrying a merchant; but I should certainly inquire anxiously what sort of a merchant he was. I do not mean that I should inquire whether he was concerned in this or that branch of commerce, but whether his mind was free from everything mercenary and illiberal. I have done so with respect to Mr. Gresham, and I can assure you solemnly, that Mr. Gresham's want of the advantage of high birth is completely counterbalanced in my opinion by his high qualities. I see in him a cultivated, enlarged, generous mind. I have seen him tried, where his passions and his interests have been nearly concerned, and I never saw in him the slightest tincture of vulgarity in manner or sentiment: therefore, my dear daughter, if he has made an impression on your heart, do not, on my account, struggle against

it; because, far from objecting to Mr. Gresham for a son-in-law, I should prefer him to any gentleman or nobleman who had not his exalted character' ".

It must be remembered that the Percys were model characters and that their exalted sentiments were meant to edify the reader. But these opinions may well be taken, if not as proof, at least as illustration of a point we formerly made on more solid grounds. Merchants, as individuals and as a class, would become more acceptable in polite society as their opportunities of education and the proper use of leisure expanded. On the marriage market they were valued for their money, and in a desperate case the culture could be dispensed with. Where the case was not desperate, and where ordinary social intercourse was involved, the lack of training in leisure would be a handicap. For that reason the moneyed man would use his opportunities to acquire that training, which, if he could not get it for himself, he could at least confer on his descendants. "It requires two generations, at least," said Rosamond, "to wash out the stain of vulgarity: neither a gentleman nor a gentlewoman can be made in less than two generations."

In many ways the impression made by Patronage is confirmed by Pride and Prejudice. Jane Austen introduced the financial background of marriage in her very first sentence: "It is a truth universally acknowledged, that a single man in possession of a good fortune must be in want of a wife". The ill-breeding that curses plebeian occupations is also most conspicuous - it is in fact the outstanding social feature of the story.

Mrs. Bennet's father had been an attorney in the

Hertfordshire town of Meryton. Mrs. Bennet is, in English literature, the classic type of vulgar inanity. Her every pronouncement caused her daughter Elizabeth to blush or squirm in uncomfortable embarrassment, and the reader blushes in sympathy. Her youngest daughters, Kitty and Lydia, were as silly as their mother. There is no very distinct picture of Mrs. Bennet's sister, Mrs. Philips, whose husband carried on the attorney's business in Meryton; but as Kitty and Lydia haunted her house for gossip, small talk and intrigue, the impression of her remains unfavourable.

Mr. Bingley was the new tenant of Netherfield Park: He had inherited a hundred thousand pounds, which his father had made in business. He brought with him to Netherfield a married and an unmarried sister. "They were of a respectable family in the north of England; a circumstance more deeply impressed on their memories than that their brother's fortune and their own had been acquired by trade." This respectable family no doubt enjoyed the same kind of "eminence" that Burke discovers in the ancestors of every new-made peer or baronet.

The Bingley sisters were distinguished by bad manners and lack of taste, in spite of their education "in one of the first private seminaries in town." They were proud and conceited, "had a fortune of twenty thousand pounds, were in the habit of spending more than they ought, and of associating with people of rank, and were therefore in every respect entitled to think well of themselves, and meanly of others."

Association with people of rank was the privilege also of Sir William Lucas, who had been in trade in Meryton and mayor of

the town, and was knighted when, during his mayoralty, he presented an address to the King. His visit to St. James' and contacts with the great were his standard topics of conversation for the rest of his life. Nor was he too great himself to be thrilled by any attentions he might receive from such people as Lady Catherine de Bourgh. It was naturally impossible for one of his status to live in a small provincial town; so Lucas Lodge was established a mile out of Meryton.

The authoress, obviously, did not think that the plebeian stamp could be easily erased. But it is important to note that in some cases it was erased. If the Bingley sisters were ill-bred, this could not be said of their brother. Mrs. Bennet's vulgarity was not shared by her brother, Mr. Gardiner, who was in business in the City and actually lived in Gracechurch Street. He "was a sensible, gentlemanlike man, greatly superior to his sister, as well by nature as by education". By his intelligence, taste and good manners he made a good impression even on the fastidious Mr. Darcy. Yet this impression was a surprise to him; and though Miss Bingley did call on Jane Bennet when she was staying with her uncle and aunt in Gracechurch Street, she regarded the call as a painful duty, which it was obvious she was not likely to perform a second time. We are reminded of Mr. Gresham, the contrast between his personal worth and the distaste felt by the Percys for his residence in the city, and of his vulgar partner's migration to Grosvenor Square. The Bingleys were only one generation removed from trade, and found the city most disagreeable. When in town they made use of Mr. Darcy's house in Grosvenor Street.

Darcy's love of Elizabeth was so strong that even his

pride could not repress it. He had no objection to her ancestry. The objection was to her living relations - her mother, Kitty, Lydia, the uncles and aunts in Meryton and the city. We remember Rosamond Percy's picture of the hypothetical St. Mary Axe cockneys. Darcy's aunt , Lady Catherine de Bourgh, in her fantastic attempt to prevent the engagement of her nephew to Elizabeth, said to the latter: "True. You <u>are</u> a gentleman's daughter. But who was your mother? Who are your uncles and aunts? Do not imagine me ignorant of their condition ."

Lady Catherine's interference achieved nothing, of course, but to encourage the match; and the bridegroom had by then discovered that more congenial society was to be found in Gracechurch Street than on his aunt's estate in Kent. "With the Gardiners, they were always on the most intimate terms. Darcy, as well as Elizabeth, really loved them; and they were both ever sensible of the warmest gratitude towards the persons who, by bringing her into Derbyshire, had been the means of uniting them." The story ends on this note.

The general impression left by the two novels could be summed up thus: the manners, tastes and habits of thought of the leisured class were qualifications for admittance to good society. With those qualifications, people even of humble birth and without money could often procure admittance. Plebeian parents, even plebeian occupations, were not in themselves a bar. Money, on the other hand, was in most cases required in a bride or bridegroom, and it was wanted so badly that where it was present the other qualities could often be dispensed with. Those qualities were not ordinarily found in people newly enriched by commerce; they would

occur more frequently in the learned professions, especially those much frequented by upper class cadets. But in both trades and professions origin would tell, partly through other members of the family. Even a wealthy suitor might be rejected because of his relations. But after two generations a new family might be thought quite comme il faut , and fit to be received and married into.

Now let a generation pass, and look at the world through the eyes of Thackeray. We take Vanity Fair and Pendennis as his most useful works for this purpose, and shall occasionally seek confirmation in The Newcomes. Thackeray was interested in snobbery, and he gives an entertaining and on the whole convincing picture of its operation in his time. We look to him for an answer to the question, what change took place in the composition of the upper class between Waterloo and the middle of the century? We should like to see what he thinks of the changing status of doctors, barristers, journalists, merchants, brewers. His answer will not be quite in the same terms as our account in Chapter 1. There is certainly a rise in the standing of these people; but the emphasis is rather on the unchanging fact that manners makyth man, and that money is used to acquire at least the outward and visible manners, if not the inward and spiritual grace on which they should be founded. Let's begin with the medical profession.

What could be more delightful than the family pride of Major Pendennis? His brother had begun life as a struggling apothecary at Bath; had "not only attended gentlemen in their sick-rooms, and ladies at the most interesting periods of their lives, but would condescend to sell a brown paper plaster to a farmer's

wife across the counter, - or to vend tooth-brushes, hair-powder, and London perfumery." But make no mistake about it, Mr. Pendennis was destined by birth for higher things. "He had a Cornish pedigree which carried the Pendennises up to the time of the Druids, - and who knows how much farther back? They had intermarried with the Normans at a very late period of their family existence, and they were related to all the great families of Wales and Brittany." When the family flourished, this antiquarian foible could be freely indulged in. Mr. Pendennis had a one-horse carriage with his arms handsomely emblazoned on its panels. His pedigree was framed and hung in his drawing-room. Next to it was a picture of St. Boniface's College, Oxbridge, which he had attended for a little over a year, and left when his father died insolvent.

This John Pendennis might have ever languished in poverty and humiliation, had not a lucky chance brought his professional skill to the service of Lady Ribstone, wife of Sir Pepin Ribstone, of Codlingbury in the county of Somerset, Bart. This chance brought the apothecary into fashion. The patronage of the Ribstones, and other great people like Lady Pontypool, enabled him to give up the tooth-brushes and perfumes, to hand over the surgery to a genteel young man, to marry Miss Helen Thistlewood, daughter of Lieutenant R. Thistlewood, R.N., killed at the battle of Copenhagen, and late companion of Lady Pontypool. A lucky purchase of shares in a copper mine added to his resources, and he bought Fairoaks, a house and small estate on the outskirts of Clavering St. Mary's. "A whole range of Pendennis portraits presently hung round the Doctor's oak dining-room; Lelys and Vandykes he vowed all the portraits to be, and when questioned as to the history of the

originals, would vaguely say that they were 'ancestors of his'. His little boy believed them to their fullest extent, and Roger Pendennis of Agincourt, Arthur Pendennis of Crecy, General Pendennis of Blenheim and Oudenarde, were as real and actual beings for this young gentleman as - whom shall we say? - as Robinson Crusoe, or Peter Wilkins, or the Seven Champions of Christendom, whose histories were in his library".

The Newcomes (in the novel of that name) had a very similar history and distorted it in exactly the same way. The first Mr. Newcome came up to London to seek his fortune when pig-tails grew on the backs of the British gentry, and Mr. Washington was leading the American rebels; "though if it could be proved that the Normans wore pigtails under William the Conqueror, and Mr. Washington fought against the English under King Richard in Palestine, I am sure some of the present Newcomes would pay the Heralds' office handsomely". The Heralds had, indeed, constructed a very good pedigree, going through the Newcome of Cromwell's army, past Bloody Mary and Bosworth Field, back to a Newcome slain by King Harold's side at Hastings.

To return to Dr. Pendennis, - he became a squire before Waterloo; at the very time when Doctors Erasmus Percy, Frumpton and Sir Amyas Courtney were advancing in their profession by the same method - the patronage of fashionable patients. We do not remember that Doctor Frumpton forged a pedigree or a coat-of-arms, or took any interest in Agincourt or the Druids; and that hobby may in fact have been less common in those days of relative social stability, than when Thackeray was writing, when newcomers to Society were pressing in greater numbers and the forgery could more

easily escape notice. Dr. Pendennis, however, aimed a little too high. He took his bride to London and "left cards upon Lord Pontypool, the Right Honourable the Earl of Bareacres, and upon Sir Pepin and Lady Ribstone, his earliest and kindest patrons. Bareacres took no notice of the cards. Pontypool called, admired Mrs. Pendennis, and said Lady Pontypool would come and see her, which her ladyship did, per proxy of John her footman, who brought her card, and an invitation to a concert five weeks off. Pendennis was back in his little one-horse carriage, dispensing draughts and pills at that time: but the Ribstones asked him and Mrs. Pendennis to an entertainment, of which Mr. Pendennis talked to the last day of his life".

When at last he could sell his practice and concentrate upon Fairoaks, he did the thing in proper style: he "attended markets and sessions, and wore a bottle-green coat and brass buttons with drab gaiters, just as if he had been an English gentleman all his life. He used to stand at his lodge-gate, and see the coaches come in, and bow gravely to the guards and coachmen as they touched their hats and drove by. It was he who founded the Clavering Book Club: and set up the Samaritan Soup and Blanket Society. It was he who bought the mail, which used to run through Cacklefield before, away from that village and through Clavering. At Church he was equally active as a vestryman and a worshipper. At market every Thursday, he went from pen to stall; looked at samples of oats, and munched corn; felt beasts, punched geese in the breast, and weighed them with a knowing air; and did business with the farmers at the Clavering Arms, as well as the oldest frequenter of that house of call".

Thus the memory of the pestle and mortar could be obliterated; we note that the first function to be dropped is that of apothecary; next, the surgery is served by deputy; the physicians role is carried on till that of the squire can be assumed.

But let twenty years pass. Young Pen is dangerously ill. His uncle the Major (who, be it remembered, was a snob of snobs) sends for his friend Doctor Goodenough, and asks the latter to meet him at one of his clubs. There is no sign, throughout the illness, of any condescension by the patient's relations, or servility on the part of his physician. It is rather the family, including the Major, that begs the doctor for instructions. This is, of course, a London doctor, not a provincial apothecary. But the lapse of time has made a difference too. The Major was especially sensitive about his brother's career as an apoth - an eminent medical practitioner, and he would not have had a friend in that profession if his titled chronies had not set the example.

The legal profession was a mixed company. Pen ate his dinners at the Upper Temple in the society of Warrington, son of a baronet, and Lowton, who dropped his h's and revered all the aristocracy. There were sons of peers and bishops; "stout gray-headed attornies who were proceeding to take the superior dignity, - dandies and men-about-town who wished for some reason to be barristers of seven years' standing, - swarthy, black-eyed natives of the Colonies, who came to be called here before they practised in their own islands, - and many gentlemen of the Irish nation, who make a sojourn in Middle Temple Lane before they return to the green country of their birth." The Benchers, who were the great men of

the Inn, were drawn from most of these classes. But the bar was always so.

As we might expect, Thackeray introduces us to journalists and publishers. A friend of Warrington's was editor of the Dawn. Lady Violet Lebas edited the Spring Annual. Pen himself made a living by writing, and among the other people with whom he was brought into social intercourse by this profession were the Honourable Percy Popjoy, the fashionable wits Wagg and Wenham, and Irish adventurers like Hoolan, Doolan and Captain Shandon. The Major was a little doubtful about his nephew's taking up this occupation; but all doubts were removed when he discovered that it involved association with men of fashion and title.

The army does not, when seen through the eyes of novelists, appear quite as blue-blooded as might have been expected. Our friend the Major was, of course, descended from a very ancient family, but it was his brother's profits from pills and plasters and the copper-mine that bought him his commission. These circumstances were conveniently forgotten, and the Major consorted exclusively with lords spiritual and temporal and other [illegible] his majesty's more genteel subjects.

We are not told the Major's regiment, but much would depend on that. The well-born Rawdon Crawley (in Vanity Fair) was a heavy dragoon; but turn to a line regiment and you will find, at the officers' mess, bourgeois like Dobbin and Osborne, and over all the Irishman (Thackeray doesn't like Irishmen) O'Dowd. Yet all these people, like Major Pendennis, were in the army to make a career and to rise in social estimation. The contempt of the dragoons for regiments of the line might be felt more keenly in

military circles than when officers mingled in civilian society.

What of commerce? Vanity Fair gives more evidence on that side than Pendennis. The Osbornes and the Sedleys were commercial families that lived in Russell Square. The heads of both were fully occupied with business; neither could be regarded as an elegant gentleman of fashion. Sedley went bankrupt when Napoleon returned from Elba, and was promptly ostracized by the Osbornes. When Osborne gave a dinner party he would invite "old Dr. Gulp and his lady from Bloomsbury Square; old Mr. Frowser, the attorney, from Bedford Row, a very great man, and from his business, hand-in-glove with the 'nobs at the West End'; old Colonel Livermore, of the Bombay Army, and Mrs. Livermore, from Upper Bedford Place; old Serjeant Toffy and Mrs. Toffy; and sometimes old Sir Thomas Coffin and Lady Coffin, from Bedford Square. Sir Thomas was celebrated as a hanging judge, and the particular tawny port was produced when he dined with Mr. Osborne." Very respectable society, but all Bloomsbury; not enough to raise a business man into the world of fashion and ton.

Yet Osborne was ambitious in that way. On the strength of his name he took the liberty of assuming the arms of the Duke of Leeds. He wanted his children to marry well. George, his only son, was deprived of his inheritance and forbidden his father's house for leading Amelia Sedley to the altar. Maria did better. It is true her husband, Frederick Bullock, was a son of the banker, of the house of Bullock, Hulker and Bullock; but then these Bullocks were "a high family of the city aristocracy, and connected with the 'nobs' at the West End." Why, they were related to the Earl of Castlemouldy. Look at the wedding guests, who were friends

of the bridegroom: "Mr. Mango and Lady Mary Mango were there, with the dear young Gwendoline and Guinever Mango as bridesmaids; Colonel Bludyer of the Dragoon Guards (eldest son of the house of Bludyer Brothers, Mincing Lane), another cousin of the bridegroom, and the Honourable Mrs. Bludyer; the Honourable George Boulter, Lord Levant's son, and his lady, Miss Mango that was; Lord Viscount Castletoddy; Honourable James M'Mull and Mrs. M'Mull (formerly Miss Swartz), and a host of fashionables, who have all married into Lombard Street, and done a great deal to ennoble Cornhill."

It appears that there were capitalists and capitalists, and that the difference was in manners as well as money. While Osbornes and Sedleys kept to Russell Square, Bullocks and Bludyers did better. The Mangos may have belonged to the same class, and Lord Levant sounds like a merchant who had fared thrice over the wide sea and thriven to thegn-right. Fred Bullock "was positively ruining and pinching himself to death to buy land." The Bullocks called their first-born Frederick Augustus Howard Stanley Devereux Bullock; they "had a house near Berkeley Square, and a small villa at Roehampton, among the banking colony there. Fred was considered to have made rather a mésalliance by the ladies of his family, whose grandfather had been in a Charity School, and who were allied through the husbands with some of the best blood in England." So Fred's Maria was "bound, by superior pride and great care in the composition of her visiting-book, to make up for the defects of birth; and felt it her duty to see her father and sister as little as possible.

"That she should utterly break with the old man, who had still so many scores of thousands of pounds to give away, is absurd

to suppose. Fred Bullock would never allow her to do that." Maria's dowry was no more than £20,000, which made Fred think himself "infamously swindled by the old merchant." He looked anxiously for more at the merchant's death. But the merchant was badly treated by his daughter. "She invites her father and sister to a second day's dinner (if those sides, or entrys, as she calls 'em, weren't served yesterday, I'm d---d), and to meet City folks and littery men, and keeps the Earls and the Ladies and the Honourables to herself? Honourables? Damn Honourables. I am a plain British merchant, I am: and could buy the beggarly hounds over and over. Lords, indeed! - why, at one of her swarreys I saw one of 'em speak to a dam fiddler - a fellar I despise. And they won't come to Russell Square, won't they ? Why, I'll lay my life I've got a better glass of wine, and pay a better figure for it, and can show a handsomer service of silver, and can lay a better dinner on my mahogany, than ever they see on theirs - the cringing, sneaking, stuck-up fools."

Osborne was of humble origin. He had been set up in business by Sedley, whose kindness he never forgave. Osborne's exclusion from the best society is easily accounted for, on the principles we have already arrived at: his attention was so completely absorbed by his business, his education had so little prepared him for anything else, that he was disqualified for leisured society. That society would find his mind and his conversation, of which we have just had a sample, little to its taste.

Other merchants fared better. Even William Dobbin, the grocer, aldermen, Colonel of the City Light Horse, knighted when

the King and the Duke of York reviewed his corps, had more social graces than Mr. Osborne.

Brewers were often very rich, and if they could behave well enough might marry very respectably. Young Pendennis' friend, Harry Foker, was the son of a brewer who had married an Earl's daughter. Mr. Foker was very rich, and his marriage to Lady Agnes was a good bargain on both sides. Mr. Foker had been to a public school - but we postpone the consideration of that.

This picture of the up-and-coming bourgeoisie is balanced by that of a decadent noblesse. The Bludyers and Bullocks bought some polish with their money; many ancient families had lost the one with the other. Sir Pitt Crawley, of Queen's Crawley, in the county of Southampton, Bart., sprang from an old stock - his father Walpole Crawley, the first baronet, was of the Tape and Sealing-Wax office, temp. George II, and was impeached for peculation; and before him there were John Churchill Crawley, Charles Stuart (nicknamed Barebones) Crawley, and so on back through the ages. Sir Pitt was a coarse old roué who spoke in Hamshire dialect, married beneath him, finally took a servant girl for his mistress, and was cut by the county.

He was hardly worse than Arthur Pendennis' neighbour Sir Francis Clavering, of Clavering St. Mary's, Bart. Sir Francis' father had gone to the continent to escape his creditors; the son, after a spell in his Majesty's prison of the Fleet, followed suit. He had the luck to marry the widow Amory, daughter of a rich merchant of Calcutta. They lived for some time on the continent, and then dared to return to England and Clavering Park. Sir Francis had a character far inferior to that of his wife, who

had not mastered either the speech or the habits of her husband's class.

Thackeray's greatest nobleman is the Marquess of Steyne, heartless and immoral, the pivot of a smart and flashy society.. He appears again in Disraeli's Coningsby as Lord Monmouth; both noble lords being, it is said, copied from a real live Marquess of Hertford. It would not be difficult for a rising bourgeois family to make a more attractive figure in society than these.

The comparison that we have here between the Napoleonic age and the 'forties confirms, but also modifies, the conclusion we drew from our sober historical facts. There is little in the novels to suggest a change during this period in the fashionable estimation of merchants or professional men. Merchants of liberal mind were well thought of in both generations. A learned profession did not of itself secure its members a position in good society in the 'forties, any more than in the earlier period.. Dowries were always in demand, but uncouth merchants were never welcome in society.

The change is rather in the personnel of the trades and professions. More merchants were educated men in the later period, more journalists were of gentle birth. All merchants and journalists were therefore brought into closer contact with the upper class. Trade and the professions were more highly esteemed as occupations. But the tradesman of crude manners was still excluded from society. The tradesman's social opportunities had improved, but he still had to exert himself to use them.

A few other novels may shed further light on the subject.

Disraeli's best work for this purpose is Coningsby. We will not speak of the position of Sidonia, the Jewish banker, who occupied a very high place in society - Sidonia means Rothschild, and that might be called an exceptional family. But the elder Millbank is very much to the point. He was a great Lancashire millowner, full of Manchester liberalism and a hatred of the aristocracy. "I have yet to learn they are richer than we are, better informed, wiser, or more distinguished for public or private virtue." Coningsby, who married Millbank's daughter, was the grandson of the great magnate Lord Monmouth. But the difficulties put in the way of this course of true love were political, not social. Lord Monmouth forbade the match, because the families were rivals in politics and also for the possession of the Hellingsley estate. Millbank bought it and was never forgiven by Monmouth. There is no suggestion that the Millbanks are a plebeian family. Edith was courted by Lord Beaumanoir as well as by Coningsby.

Another business man who belonged to the highest society was Mr. Kennedy, in Trollope's Phineas Finn (1869). He was of the second generation, and his father had bought the estate of Loughlinter for him. He married Lady Laura Standish. More interesting than this is the case of Phineas himself, the son of an Irish country doctor. He aspired to Lady Laura's hand, and was rejected solely because they were both poor - she would have overlooked his poverty if she had had resources herself. His birth was never counted against him.

Now take up Charlotte Brontë. We have already pointed

out that Shirley is a story of the years before Charlotte Brontë was born, and we cannot be sure to which period it ought rightly to belong. But no matter; her stories cannot be illustrations of ordinary social conventions, since she allows overpowering passions to tear those conventions to pieces. Robert Gérard Moore hires a mill in Yorkshire; his brother Louis is a family tutor. They come of good mercantile stock, a Yorkshire trading family on one side, and on the other Antwerp merchants for two centuries. The wars have ruined both firms. Robert, of Hollow's Mill, is nevertheless accepted by the neighbourhood as a gentleman. "He looks the gentleman, in my sense of the term", said Miss Shirley Keeldar, who owned the land thereabouts and had returned, after coming of age, to inhabit her manor house.

Robert wanted to marry Shirley for her money, and was rejected. His brother Louis, the tutor, dared to propose to her, and was accepted. Louis' employer, Shirley's uncle, was dumb-founded to hear of the engagement. "Good God!" he exclaimed, just as Major Pendennis would have done. But Louis' words to Shirley had been: "For the first time I stand before you myself. I have flung off the tutor, and beg to introduce you to the man. And remember, he is a gentleman."

Irrepressible passions existed before 1815 as much as in 1849. Charlotte Brontë may have been projecting into the past a phenomenon of her own time, but we need hardly ask whether she did so or not. This marriage was, as all marriages should be, unique - it was not a mere example of a prevailing convention. Nevertheless we ought not to miss the point that Shirley regarded both the Moores as gentlemen, when they had neither money nor

gentle birth.

Two principal impressions remain. Society asked of its members that they should be qualified in the customary use of leisure, and should possess the habits and mental attitudes arising therefrom. Society also lived expensively, and its members must have money. The emphasis was now on the money, now on the manners, but mostly on both at the same time. The Industrial Revolution, as it progressed through the century, enlarged the opportunities of acquiring the one and the other.

So much for Society. What can the novels tell us of the social pattern of Parliament? We shall look for this in Patronage, Coningsby and Phineas Finn, and in Thackeray.

We need hardly stop to point out that county members, after as before the Reform Act, had a much higher social standing than borough members, and were drawn more exclusively from the upper class. The contrast was even sharper after the middle class had its industrial towns enfranchised. Mr. Percy (in Patronage) had thought, though with distaste, of standing for his county in his prosperous days as a great landowner. After losing his estates he was offered, and refused, a borough seat. Arthur Pendennis had, in his extravagant days at Oxbridge, allowed the rumour to circulate that he would stand for his county - a scheme of which no more was heard when he was older, wiser, and working for his living. The prospective county member then was young Pynsent, Lord Rochminster's son. He visited Fen's place, Fairoaks, in the company of the fashionable and vulgar wit Mr. Wagg. Wag eyed the unpretentious house, garden and occupants critically.

"Old gardener," he said to Pynsent, "old red livery waistcoat - clothes hanging out to dry on the gooseberry bushes - blue aprons, white ducks - gad, they must be young Pendennis's white ducks - nobody else wears 'em in the family. Rather a shy place for a sucking county member, ay, Pynsent?"

The county members were in effect chosen by the land-owners, who controlled the votes of their tenants. Disraeli tells us (in Coningsby) that Eustace Lyle, the Catholic landowner of ancient family, on coming into his estate abandoned the Whigs, eschewed all party connections, and announced "that his tenantry might act exactly as they thought fit." A magnanimous gesture which shows up the normal political status of the tenantry.

We know how rotten boroughs were controlled before 1832. The novels throw some light on the patron's choice of his representatives. Lord Oldborough (Vatronage) offered his friend Mr. Percy one of his borough seats. He 'brought in' Temple, his private secretary, for another - both men of good family, but one his protégé and the other an old friend who had fallen on hard times, and who might from a seat in Parliament catch some plums of official patronage.

The disreputable Sir Pitt Crawley (Vanity Fair) sat himself for one of the seats at Queen's Crawley; the other was sold for fifteen hundred a year - at this period to "Mr. Quadroon, with carte-blanche on the Slave question."

A good representative of the (genealogically) more humble members of the unreformed House would be Disraeli's Rigby. "His origin, education, early pursuits, and studies, were equally

obscure; but he had contrived in good time to squeeze himself into parliament, by means which no one could ever comprehend." After a long struggle, a long series of political successes and failures, he met Lord Monmouth. He became the manager of that lord's political influence, auditor of his estates, member for one of his boroughs, his "companion when in England, his correspondent when abroad; hardly his counsellor, for Lord Monmouth never required advice; but Mr. Rigby could instruct him in matters of detail, which Mr. Rigby made amusing." He was thus the type of quite a considerable class of nominated members, who (like Rigby) for the most part disappeared from the arena in 1832.

Some boroughs remained pretty close after that date, and we have some illuminating pictures of a few of them. Sir Francis Clavering (Pendennis) sat for his borough of Clavering, almost as a matter of course. He played no part in politics, but a seat was a convenient refuge from creditors, and he liked to go down to the House for a game of billiards with Captain Raff and Mr. Marker. "It's dev'lish convenient, being in Parliament. There's very few seats like mine left; and if I gave it 'em I should not wonder the ministry would give me an island to govern, or some dev'lish good thing; for you know I'm a gentleman of dev'lish good family, and have a handle to my name, and - and that sort of thing, Major Pendennis. Eh, don't you see? Don't you think they'd give me something dev'lish good if I was to play my cards well?" The Major wanted him to give up his seat to young Arthur, about whose return in that case there was no manner of doubt. "You have a mind to retire; he is a Clavering man, and a good

representative for the borough; you introduce him, and your people vote for him - you see."

These post-Reform close boroughs worked much as some of them had done before 1832. Taper (Coningsby) "had his eye on a small constituency which had escaped the fatal schedules, and where he had what they called a 'connection'; that is to say, a section of the suffragers who had a lively remembrance of Treasury favours once bestowed by Mr. Taper, and who had not been so liberally dealt with by the existing powers. This connection of Taper was in time to leaven the whole mass of the constituent body, and make it rise in full rebellion against the present liberal representative, who being one of a majority of three hundred, could get nothing when he called at Whitehall or Downing Street."

Another motive with the close borough voters is seen at Loughton (Phineas Finn). The Earl of Brentford offered the seat to Phineas, and this is how the election was managed: "Phineas went down to Loughlinter early in July, taking Loughton in his way. He stayed there one night at the inn, and was introduced to sundry influential inhabitants of the borough by Mr. Grating, the ironmonger, who was known by those who knew Loughton to be a very strong supporter of the Earl's interest. Mr. Grating and about half-a-dozen others of the tradesmen of the town came to the inn, and met Phineas in the parlour. He told them he was a good sound Liberal and a supporter of Mr. Mildmay's Government, of which their neighbour the Earl was so conspicuous an ornament. This was almost all that was said about the Earl out loud; but each individual man of Loughton then present took an opportunity

during the meeting of whispering into Mr. Finn's ear a word or two to show that he also was admitted to the secret councils of the borough, - that he too could see the inside of the arrangement. 'Of course we must support the Earl', one said. 'Never mind what you hear about a Tory candidate, Mr. Finn', whispered a second; 'the Earl can do what he pleases here.' And it seemed to Phineas that it was thought by them all to be rather a fine thing to be thus held in the hand by an English nobleman. Phineas could not but reflect much upon this as he lay in his bed at the Loughton inn. The great political question on which the political world was engrossed up in London was the enfranchisement of Englishmen, - of Englishmen down to the ranks of artisans and labourers; - and yet when he found himself in contact with individual Englishmen, with men even very much above the artisan and the labourer, he found that they rather liked being bound hand and foot, and being kept as tools in the political pocket of a rich man. Every one of those Loughton tradesmen was proud of his own personal subjection to the Earl."

Borough elections were to be explained in terms of a dying feudalism as well as of latter-day jobbery. Lord Oldborough offered a seat to his friend Mr. Percy, or to Temple, both men of old landed family. Lord Brentford offered one to his friend Phineas, son of an Irish country doctor.

Trollope gives few clues to the origin and social standing of the many politicians who figure in Phineas Finn. Turnbull, the great Radical, was still in business, and said to make thirty thousand a year. He was surrounded by powdered

footmen, affected a republican indifference to pomp, ceremony and footmen, and lacked a sense of humour. Mr. Monk, a Whig minister of Radical opinions, had his dinner guests received by a maid-servant. Mr. Kennedy was the son of an industrial magnate. Many of the politicians were "high Whigs", related to one another and to the great Whig nobility. For the rest we have no clue, save the significant fact that Phineas himself was received in these high Whig circles on terms almost of equality.

Disraeli had a penchant for the titled aristocracy, who accordingly figure prominently in his stories. The only politicians in Coningsby entirely without patrician connections were Millbank, the Lancashire industrial magnate, who preferred bourgeois society but was well received by the county, and the Radical shopkeeper Jawster Sharpe. Sharpe was elected for the newly enfranchised borough of Darlford. While in the House he feathered his own nest comfortably, to the disgust of the electors, and "it was an understood thing that Jawster Sharpe was never to show his face again on the hustings of Darlford; the Liberal party was determined to be represented in future by a man of station, substance, character, a true Reformer, but one who wanted nothing for himself, and therefore might, if needful, get something for them". So Sharpe gave place to Millbank; and after Millbank, Coningsby.

We have here the contrast between county members, close borough members and members for industrial towns; between the unreformed Parliament and the Parliament that was to make the second Reform. This is the full tale of politicians to be

found in these novels; and as no novelist will describe more than a handful of Parliamentarians, who need not be in any way a representative selection, we need look no further in this direction for the total social composition of the legislature.

The schools, public and other, have been a commoner theme of fiction than the House of Commons. Apart from the classic Tom Brown's Schooldays, in which Hughes gives a picture of Rugby under Arnold, we have many references to schools and schoolfellows in the novels where we sought our pictures of society. Thackeray's Grey Friars is his own school, Charterhouse. Disraeli, in Coningsby, gives a fairly detailed and, though second hand, trustworthy picture of Eton life.

Eton is, in all the novels, the school for well-born characters. Sir Pitt Crawley's sons were sent there. Pendennis had been at Grey Friars, but his friend George Warrington (son of the Suffolk baronet) and the Honourable Percy Popjoy were Etonians. Colonel Newcome sent his son to Grey Friars, but his half-brother, who married into the aristocracy, sent his little Egbert to Eton. Coningsby was an Etonian, and the grandson of a Marquess.

Consider Coningsby's friends at school: Lord Vere, Lord Henry Sydney, Sir Charles Buckhurst. There was one other, Oswald Millbank, son of the great industrialist; he and Clive Newcome were the only Etonians not of gentle birth that can be found in any of these works. Disraeli mentions many of Coningsby's schoolfellows by name, but as English names do not usually bear the mark of class we learn nothing from those.

Thackeray's Grey Friars was rather more plebeian, like its prototype the Charterhouse. As Thackeray was a Carthusian, the Grey Friars boys were called Cistercians (a slip; they should have been Franciscans - but let that pass). Pen was a Cistercian; so was his uncle the Major. Harry Foker was there too - the son of a brewer and of the daughter of an Earl. Harry had his leg pulled about his father's business, but no doubt most of the teasers would have liked an Earl for a grandfather. The middle-class character of the school is seen even more clearly in The Newcomes. Old Mr. Hobson and his brother were Cistercians, and were not only of middle class or humble origin, but practised business as cloth-factors. Colonel Newcome, whose father was a business man of humble birth, was educated at this school, and his son there after him. The Grey Friars' school is thus just what we would expect of a public school below the rank of Eton, Westminster and Harrow. But it would not do to be too humble even at Grey Friars. The first questions a new boy was asked by his fellows were: "What is your name? Who is your father? How much money have you got?".

If we look to Tom Brown for information about the social origins of Rugby boys, we shall get very little. Tom's own father was a Berkshire squire; George Arthur's was a saintly clergyman of a poor industrial parish, and died before his son went to Rugby. Of the others we know nothing.

But Tom Brown gives us something that we could not get from the Rugby School Register - an insight into the public school process of social assimilation. In relation to the rest of the

world, all the boys had a uniform status. Coachmen and gamekeepers treated all the "young gentlemen" with the same deference or exercised over them the same vicarious authority. The boys were a single and homogeneous class in their distinction from the local farmers or the town boys, known technically as "louts". In all Hughes' description of the intimate relationships of this world of boys, there is no suggestion that the status of a boy's parents had the slightest bearing upon his school life. This may be a deliberate omission, since the book is frankly meant for propaganda; but if there had been anything of the sort omitted, we may well believe there was very little of it.

For this reason: the school had a hierarchy of its own, distinctions of its own, even snobbery of a peculiar kind. Old Brooke was "cock of the school". He said to East, after the football match, " 'Well, mind and get all right for next Saturday;' and the leader passed on, leaving East better for those few words than all the opodeldoc in England would have made him, and Tom ready to give one of his ears for as much notice." Old Brooke's parentage had no part in this. It was his rank in the school, his football prowess, and (Hughes would have us believe) his character that put him upon this pedestal.

There were praepostors and fags: a distinction chiefly of age, with learning and character as incidental factors. There were unpopular bullies - Flashman, who never lacked pocket-money, but it is not suggested that he was a bully on account of some weakness in his pedigree. Martin was thought a madman because he collected birds' eggs, tamed snakes and conducted scientific

experiments; again, a purely personal idiosyncrasy, with which heraldry had nothing to do. The school was, in fact, a republic, the realm of equality, in which the very few social misfits were slaves or aliens who could not disprove the equality and republicanism of the citizenry.

As the spirit of republicanism may be fortified by the sight of the Parthenon or of the Statue of Liberty, so was this schoolboy equality founded upon pride in the school and its antiquities. "The best house in the best school in England" is the toast. A standard is set for all to follow. A standard in small things like hats ("only the louts wear caps") or in big things: "Every school, indeed, has its own traditionary standard of right and wrong, which cannot be transgressed with impunity, marking certain things as low and blackguard, and certain others as lawful and right. This standard is ever varying, though it changes only slowly, and little by little; and, subject only to such standard, it is the leading boys for the time being who give the tone to all the rest, and make the School either a noble institution for the training of Christian Englishmen, or a place where a young boy will get more evil than he would if he were turned out to make his way in London streets, or anything between these two extremes."

These influences would not be sought in a day school, a small grammar school or a private school. Who went to village grammar schools? Of course we can assume that that Berkshire village school in Tom Brown, where the village boys went, was less than a grammar school. But there was a grammar school at

Clavering St. Mary's (in Pendennis), and its most genteel pupil (a parlour boarder) was young Hobnell, whose family were yeomen farmers in the neighbourhood, and now aspiring to a higher status. For the rest, the school served the village. There was a similar grammar school in Shirley, attended by the sons of the small manufacturer Mr. Yorke.

On a higher level was Dr. Swishtail's Academy, mentioned in Vanity Fair. George Osborne held his head high there because his father, though a merchant, was "a gentleman and kept his carriage". We met that gentleman before. Now poor William Dobbin's father was a grocer; Dobbin had been nicknamed Gee-ho, Heigh-ho and what not, but when his father's trade was known they called him Figs, teased him and made his life a misery.

Will it be said, from this evidence, that fiction leads us to the same conclusions as fact? We could not have drawn those conclusions from the fiction alone. Each writer, each novel, presents us with a different facet of the whole, yet we can never be sure that they are facets of the same whole; the writers may be looking at different things. We would hesitate to base our argument on the novels.

But they may usefully be introduced to add the corroborative detail. Consider what was our interpretation of the whole social-political-educational process, and it will be seen that fiction does not give it the lie.

Before England was much affected by the Industrial Revolution, the landowning class was pre-eminent in society and controlled Parliament. But then the parliamentary life required

wealth and leisure, and these also shaped the man who would participate in polished social intercourse. Society and Parliament were made for the leisured class, and landownership was normally the only source of wealth that was compatible with a life of leisure.

As the Industrial Revolution progressed, trade and industry enriched an ever increasing number of families. At last - and especially with the general introduction of limited liability - this source of wealth ceased to involve necessarily a continuous participation in business affairs. An income from industry or trade, like a landowner's rent-roll, could maintain a man of leisure. Thus the ranks of the leisured class were accessible first to men whose fathers had made money in business, then to the business men themselves.

The old leisured class still had its tests and shibboleths, its old though changing standards. Only early and intimate contact with that class would qualify a newcomer to mix freely in it thereafter. The Public Schools provided the opportunity of this contact. They were increasingly patronised by the upper class, as bringing up youth in the way most favoured in the Victorian age. The rising middle class was glad to follow the fashion thus set. A common stamp was impressed upon both; the leisured class could now be recruited to an indefinite extent from the new world of business, not only because industrial wealth gave leisure, but because through the Public Schools it bought its way to a share in the traditions of leisured life. The coat-of-arms of the gentilhomme thereby lost its exclusive distinction, and a time could be foreseen when its place would be

taken by the Old School Tie.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

A. Reference Works, Biographical.

Dictionary of National Biography.

The Concise Dictionary of National Biography, from the beginning to 1921. London. Oxford University Press.

Sir Bernard Burke: A Genealogical and Heraldic Dictionary of the Peerage and Baronetage, together with Memoirs of the Privy Councillors and Knights. 54th edn. London, 1892. Harrison and Sons.

Sir Bernard Burke: A Genealogical and Heraldic History of the Landed Gentry of Great Britain and Ireland. 8th edn. London, 1894. Harrison and Sons.

Edmund Lodge: The Peerage of the British Empire as at Present existing, to which is added the Baronetage. 12th edn. London, 1843. Saunders and Otley.

Joseph Haydn: The Book of Dignities. London, 1851. Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans.

Edward Walford: County Families of the United Kingdom. 36th Annual publ. London, 1886. Chatto and Windus.

G. H. Townsend: Men of the Time. 7th edn. London, 1868 Routledge.

Thompson Cooper: Men of the Time. 8th edn. London, 1872. Routledge.

Victor G. Plarr: Men and Women of the Time. 15th edn. London, 1899. Routledge.

Who Was Who, 1897-1916. London, 1920. Black.

B. General Topographical Works.

The Victoria History of the Counties of England. Westminster. Archibald Constable. (e.g., Hampshire and the Isle of Wight, 1900-1914).

Various Authors: The Beauties of England and Wales, or Delineations, Topographical, Historical and Descriptive, of each County. 18 vols. (25 as bound). London, 1801-1815. Vernor and Hood, and John Harris.

J. P. Neale: Views of the Seats of Noblemen and Gentlemen in England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales. 1st Series, 6 vols. 2nd Series, 3 vols. London, 1818-1826.

Sir Walter Besant: London in the Eighteenth Century. London 1925. Black.

Sir Walter Besant: London in the Nineteenth Century. London 1909. Black.

Samuel Bagshaw: History, Gazetteer and Directory of Shropshire, etc., etc. Sheffield, 1851. Bagshaw.

C. Periodical Publications.

The Gentleman's Magazine, from 1818 to 1868.

The Annual Register, from 1818 to 1897.

Punch, especially Vols. I, II, III, IV, XXIX, XXX, XXXI, XXXII.

T. C. Hansard: The Parliamentary Debates. (London, T.C.Hansard, and for the later volumes Cornelius Buck). Volumes 40; New Series, 16; Third Series, 150, 181.

The Edinburgh Review, Vols. XVI, LI, LII, LIII.

The Quarterly Review, Vols. LII, LVII.

The Cornhill Magazine, Vol. I.

Economica, Vol., V.

Economic History, Vol. II.

D. Society and Parliament.

1. Contemporary Sources, including biographies consisting largely of contemporary material - correspondence, dairies etc

In approximate chronological order.

Caroline Grosvenor and Charles Beilby, Lord Stuart of Wortley: The First Lady Wharncliffe and Her Family (1779-1856) 2 Vols. London, 1927. Heinemann.

Mrs. C.L.H.Papendiek: Court and Private Life in the Time of Queen Charlotte. 2 Vols. London, 1887. Bentley.

C. A. G. Goede: Reize door Engeland, gedaan in de jaren 1802 en 1803. (Dutch translation from German). 3 Vols. Haarlem, 1807. Francois Bohn.

Lytton Strachey and Roger Fulford (ed.): The Greville Memoirs, 1814-1860. 8 Vols. London, 1938. Macmillan.

Philip Whitwell Wilson (ed): The Greville Diary. 2 Vols. London, 1927. Heinemann.

Lady Seymour: The "Pope" of Holland House; Selections from the Correspondence of John Whishaw and his friends, 1813-1840. London, 1906. T. Fisher Unwin.

Earl of Ilchester (ed): Journal of the Hon. Henry Edward Fox, 1818-1830. London, 1923. Thornton Butterworth.

Duke of Buckingham and Chandos: Memoirs of the Court of England during the Regency, 1811-1820. 2 Vols. London, 1856. Hurst and Blackett.

Rachel Leighton (ed): Correspondence of Charlotte Grenville, Lady Williams Wynn, and Her Three Sons. London, 1920 John Murray.

Graham Wallas: The Life of Francis Place, 1771-1854. London, 1898. Longmans, Green.

F. W. Hackwood: William Hone, His Life and Times. London, 1912. T. Fisher Unwin.

W. M. Torrens: Memoirs of the Right Honourable William, Second Viscount Melbourne. 2 Vols. London, 1878. Macmillan.

Lewis Melville (ed): The Huskisson Papers. London, 1931. Constable.

Charles L. Graves: Mr. Punch's History of Modern England. 2 Vols. London, 1921. Cassell.

W. M. Thackeray: The Book of Snobs. (In volume including The Legend of the Rhine, etc.) Oxford, 1908. University Press.

Elizabeth Davis Bancroft: Letters from England, 1846-1849. London, 1904. Smith, Elder.

Francis Wey: A Frenchman Sees the English in the 'Fifties. Adapted from the French by Valerie Pirie. London, 1935. Sidgwick and Jackson.

Ellen Twistleton Vaughan (ed): Letters of the Hon. Mrs. Edward Twistleton, written to her family, 1852-1862. London, 1928. John Murray.

Henry Vizetelly: Glances Back Through Seventy Years. 2 Vols. London, 1893. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner.

S. M. Ellis (ed): The Letters and Memoirs of Sir William Hardman, Second Series, 1863-1865. London, 1925 Cecil Palmer.

Laura Hain Friswell: In the Sixties and Seventies. Impressions of Literary People and Others. London, 1905. Hutchinson.

Ralph Nevill (ed): The Reminisences of Lady Dorothy Nevill. Third Impression. London, 1906. Edward Arnold.

Ralph Nevill: The World of Fashion, 1837-1922. London, 1923. Methuen.

Helen, Countess Dowager of Radnor: From a Great-Grandmother's Armchair. London (No date). The Marshall Press.

Lord Frederic Hamilton: The Days Before Yesterday. London, 1920 Hodder and Stoughton.

2. Other Works.

Witt Bowden: Industrial Society in England towards the End of the Eighteenth Century. New York, 1925. Macmillan.

Hon. George C. Brodrick: English Land and English Landlords. London, 1881. Cobden Club.

John, Lord Campbell: Lives of Lord Lyndhurst and Lord Brougham. (Volume 8 of Lives of the Chancellors). London, 1869 Murray.

Emmeline W. Cohen: The Growth of the British Civil Service, 1780-1939. London, 1941. Allen and Unwin.

A. C. Fox-Davies: The Art of Heraldry. London, 1904. Jack.

Elie Halévy: A History of the English People in 1815. Trans. from the French by E. I. Watkin and D. A. Barker. London, 1924. T. Fisher Unwin.

James Hutton: A Hundred Years Ago. A Sketch, 1768 to 1756. London, 1857. Longmans.

Justin McCarthy: Sir Robert Peel. London, 1891. S. Low, Marston, Searle and Rivington.

P. J. Mantoux: The Industrial Revolution in the Eighteenth Century. Revised ed., translated by Marjorie Vernon. London, 1928. Cape.

Harriet Martineau: A History of the Thirty Years' Peace, A.D. 1816 - 1846. 4 Vols. London, 1877-8. George Bell and Sons.

L. B. Namier: The Structure of Politics at the Accession of

George III. 2 vols. London, 1929. Macmillan.

Edward Porritt: The Unreformed House of Commons. Vol 1. Cambridge, 1909. University Press.

J. A. Thomas: The House of Commons, 1832-1901. A Study of its Economic and Functional Character. Cardiff, 1939. University of Wales Press Board.

J. R. Thursfield: Peel. London, 1928. Macmillan.

J. Timbs: Club Life of London, with anecdotes of the clubs, coffee-houses and taverns during 17th - 19th centuries. 2 Vols. London, 1866. Bentley.

Spencer Walpole: A History of England from the Conclusion of the Great War in 1815. Vol. 1: London, 1902. Longmans, Green.

G. M. Young (ed): Early Victorian England. 1830-1865. 2 Vols. London, 1934. Oxford University Press.

E. The Schools.

1. General.

Nicholas Carlisle: A Concise Description of the Endowed Grammar Schools of England and Wales. 2 Vols. London, 1818. Baldwin, Cradock and Joy.

Census of Great Britain, 1851: Education; Report and Tables. London, 1854. Eyre and Spottiswoode.

Royal Commission for enquiring into the endowments and funds of certain colleges and schools in England, and into the management of these Schools: 1861. Report of the Public Schools Commission (and minutes of evidence.) Vol 1, Report. Vol 11. Appendix to Report. Vols 111 and 1V. Minutes of Evidence. London, 1864. H.M.S.O. (C. 3288).

R. L. Archer: Secondary Education in the Nineteenth century. Cambridge, 1921. University Press.

J. W. Adamson: English Education, 1789-1902. Cambridge, 1930 University Press.

W. L. C. : The Public Schools. Edinburgh, 1867. Blackwood.

Howard Staunton: The Great Schools of England. London, 1869. Strahan.

Anon: Our Public Schools. London, 1881. C. Kegan Paul.

Various Authors: Great Public Schools. London, No date. Edward Arnold.

Charles Eyre Pascoe (ed): Everyday Life in Our Public Schools. 2nd ed. London, No date. Griffith and Farran.

T. Pellatt: Public Schools and Public Opinion. London, 1904. Longmans, Green.

Various Authors: The Public Schools from Within. London, 1906. Sampson Low, Marston.

H. F. W. Deane and W. A. Evans (ed): The Public Schools Year Book, 1912. London, 1912. The Year Book Press.

Bernard Darwin: The English Public School. London, 1929. Longmans, Green.

John Rodgers: The Old Public Schools of England. London, 1938. B. T. Batsford.

2. Particular Schools.

H. C. Adams: Wykehamica: A History of Winchester College and Commoners, from the Foundation to the Present Day. Oxford, 1878. James Parker.

Arthur F. Leach: A History of Winchester College. London, 1899 Duckworth.

A. K. Cook: About Winchester College. London, 1917. Macmillan.

John Bannerman Wainewright (ed): Winchester College, 1836-1906. A Register. Winchester, 1907. P. and G. Wells.

H. C. Maxwell Lyte: A History of Eton College, 1440-1884. 2nd ed. London, 1889. Macmillan.

Lionel Cust: A History of Eton College. 2nd ed. London, 1909. Duckworth.

H. E. C. Stapylton: Eton School Lists from 1791 to 1877. Eton, 1885. R. Ingalton Drake.

J. Brinsley-Richards (ed): Seven Years at Eton, 1857-1864. 2nd ed. London, 1883. Bentley.

Arthur Campbell Ainger: Memories of Eton Sixty Years Ago. London, 1917. Murray.

E. Gambier-Parry: Annals of an Eton House, with some notes on the Evans family. London, 1907. Murray.

Henry S. Salt: Memories of Bygone Eton. London, No date. Hutchinson.

Ralph Nevill: Floreat Etona; Anecdotes and Memories of Eton College. London, 1911. Macmillan.

G. F. Russell Barker and Alan H. Stenning: The Record of Old Westminsters, from the earliest times to 1927. 2 Vols. London, 1928. Chiswick Press.

J. D. Carleton: Westminster. London and Glasgow, 1938. Blackie.

Percy M. Thornton: Harrow School and its Surroundings. London, 1885. W. H. Allen.

M. G. Dauglish and P. K. Stephenson (ed): The Harrow School Register, 1800-1911. 3rd. ed. London, 1911. Longmans Green.

W. H. D. Rouse: A History of Rugby School. London, 1898. Duckworth.

Rugby School Register; Vol 1, 1675-1849. Rugby, 1881. Vol. 11, 1850-1874. Rugby, 1886. A. J. Lawrence.

J. J. Findlay (ed): Arnold of Rugby, His School Life and Contributions to Education. Cambridge, 1897. University Press.

G. W. Fisher: Annals of Shrewsbury School. London, 1899. Methuen.

J. E. Auden (ed): Shrewsbury School Register. Vol, 1. 1798-1908. Shrewsbury, 1928. Wilding and Son.

E. F. Eardley Wilmot and E. C. Streatfeild: Charterhouse, Old and New. London, 1895. John C. Nimmo.

Merchant Taylors' School Archeological Society: Merchant Taylors' School, Its Origin, History and Present Surroundings. Oxford, 1929. Blackwell.

Rev: William Baker: Merchant Taylors' School Register, 1871-1900. London, 1907. Richard Clay and Sons.

C. M. Picciotto: St. Paul's. London and Glasgow, 1939. Blackie.

Edmund Blunden: Christ's Hospital, a Retrospect. London, 1923. Christophers.

R. Brimley Johnson: Christ's Hospital: Recollections of Lamb, Coleridge and Leigh Hunt; some account of

its Foundation. London, 1902. George Allen.

N. G. Brett-James: The History of Mill Hill School, 1807-1923. Reigate, 1925. T. Malcomson.

St Peter's College, Radley. Register, 1847-1923. Oxford, 1923. University Press.

G. R. Parkin: Edward Thring, Headmaster of Uppingham School; Life, Dairy and Letters. London, 1910. Macmillan.

Edward Thring: Education and School. Cambridge and London, 1864. Macmillan.

O. F. Christie: A History of Clifton College, 1860-1934. Bristol, 1935. J. W. Arrowsmith.

J. L. Bevir: The Making of Wellington College, being an account of the first sixteen years of its existence. London, 1920. Edward Arnold.

F. Fiction.

Maria Edgeworth: Patronage.

Jane Austen: Pride and Prejudice.

Benjamin Disraeli: Coningsby.

T. Hughes: Tom Brown's Schooldays.

W. M. Thackeray: Vanity Fair.
Pendennis.
The Newcomes.

Charlotte Brontë: Shirley.

Anthony Trollope: Phineas Finn, the Irish Member.

A P P E N D I X.

Analysis of Carlisle's Endowed Grammar Schools of England and Wales.

Co. = Corporate

Cr. = Crown.

P. = Private

P. B. = Parlour Boarders

P. P. = Private Pupils

APPENDIX

ANALYSIS OF CARLISLE: ENDOWED GRAMMAR SCHOOLS OF ENGLAND AND WALES.

SCHOOL	(1) DATE OF FOUNDN.	(2) ORIG. END.BY.	(3) ADD. END.BY.	(4) AMT. END.IN 1817-18(ca).	(5) NATURE OF FOUNDATION.	(6) NON-FOUNDATIONERS.	(7) AVERAGE EXPENSES OF FOUNDATIONERS.	(8) AVERAGE EXP. OF NON-FOUND.	(9) MASTER'S SALARY.	(10) MASTER'S INC. FROM OTHER SOURCES.	(11) TOTAL NO. OF BOYS IN 1817-18	(12) UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENTS
BEDFORD:-												
1. Bedford.	1552	P. Cr?	P.	More than £6,000 p.a. (not all for school)	Children born in town. (Now about 20.)No. not limited. Ages 8 - 18.	"Strangers", undefined, as boarders. (8 - 18 yesrs). (Same as pupils? No., 30).	Free?	Pupils, 55gns. and extras.	£200.	As under (8).	56	4.
2. Houghton-Conquest.	1632	P.	P.		Inhabitants? There are never more than 10 - English Educ. only.		Free.		£16.		10	None.
BERKSHIRE:-												
3. Abingdon.	1563	P.	P.		63 boys of town and adjacent villages, Orig. end.; 6 by subsequent, to have £50 apprentice fee at end. Now only 3 total.	Master takes boarders (at present 6).	Free.	Boarders 60 gns. 4 gns. entr.	Less than £80, and house.	As under (8).	9? 3?	About 7.
4. Childrey, Nr. Wantage.	1526	P.		Upwards of £1,000.	Children of Parish, free if poor. (Now 3 R's only).	No others now.	Free.	?	£8, lives in Almshouse.			None.
5. Newbury.				£12 from Cr. Land Revenues.	No school since 1814.							
6. Reading.	Ca.1486.	P.	P.		Boys of town and others		Free?					4?
7. Wallingford.	1659.	P		£20 paid by Merchant Taylors.	Now "in a very low state".				Orig. £10.			
8. Wantage.	1598.	?			Boys of Parish, for Classics.	No pupils taken by present Master.	Free.		£30.			None?
BUCKINGHAM:-												
9. Amersham.	1621	P.		£90.	Any Parishioners, but only for Classics. (There are now none).				£90, and house.	Is (at present) also Curate.		1 uncertain
10. Aylesbury.	Ca.1584?	P.		More than £400.	Boys of Aylesbury and Walton, 120 in English and writing school, 15 in Latin.	No. inconsiderable. Master takes pupils.	Free.	Terms vary.	£170 and house.	As under (8).	135.	None.
11. Buckingham.	Temp. Edw. VI.	Cr.			Not defined - now only 6, who learn Eng., writing and arith. only. (Lower classes).	No others mentioned.	Free.		Orig. £3.6.8½.		6.	None.
12. Eton.	1440-2.	Cr.	P.		70 scholars chosen by Electors from anywhere, born in Engl. or Wales.	From anywhere, no limit of no.		Should not be more than £100.			471.	About 82.
13. High Wycombe.	Refounded 1562	Cr.	P.		Boys of town, for Latin only. Seems to be regarded as Prep. School.	M. takes boarders.	Free.	40 gns. for boarders.	£30, house and garden.	As under (8).		None.
14. Marlow.	1624.	P.			Inhabitants of Gt. Marlow,16, Little M.6, Medmenham 2. English Educ. only. Ages 10-14.	M. takes pupils.	Free?	25 gns. boarders, 1 gn. entrance.	£30, house, garden.	As under (8).	24?	None.

SCHOOL	DATE OF FOUNDN.	ORIG. END.BY	ADD. END.BY	AMT.END.IN 1817-18 (Ca.)	NATURE OF FOUNDATION.	NON-FOUNDATIONERS.	AVERAGE EXPENSES OF FOUNDATIONERS	AVERAGE EXP. OF NON-FOUND.	MASTER'S SALARY	MASTER'S INC.FROM OTHER SOURCES.	TOTAL NO. OF BOYS IN 1817-18	UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENTS.
LEICESTER:-												
190. Appleby Parva, Nr. Atherstone.	1697.	P.	None.		"All boys indiscriminately" (but evidently meaning day boys).	Master takes boarders (House big enough for 60, and his own family). Engl. Master doesn't.	Free.	Boarders £30 p.a.	£80, House and Garden.	As under (8).		None.
191. Ashby de la Zouch.	1567.	P.		£370.13.0, and bdgs. worth about £750 p.a.	Boys of Parish, no limit of no.	Extra-Parochial, about 20-30. And master takes P.P. as boarders.	Free.	P.P. 70 gns. Extra-Parochial sch. also pay.	£150, House and Garden.	As under (8).	Ca. 100.	Preference (shared with Derby) to 10.
192. Market Bosworth.	1593.	P.		Nearly £700.	Boys of 2 Parishes, and sons of tenants of Founder's family, for Classics.				Formerly £101, now more?			
193. Market Harborough	1614.	P.	P.		Originally 15, Classics, Now 100, Engl. Educ. only.	No others.	Free.		£23.		Ca. 100.	None.
194. Kibworth, Nr.Market Harborough.	Ancient, restored 1614.											
195. Leicester.	Ancient.		P.		Sons of Freemen, Freemen's widows, and deceased Resident Freemen. (now about 20).	Boarders taken by Master (now 10).	1 gn. entrance, 2 gns. p.a.	Boarders 40 gns.	£122.3.10.	As under (8).	30.	2.
196. Loughborough.	*At Reformation.	P.	P.	£1100.	Free for residents. Master has Grammar pupils (20)- 2nd Master teaches 3 R's (25), 3rd Master (nearly 30). Added (on Bell System) 120.	Master may, but doesn't, take boarders.	Free.		£200, House, and Garden.		Ca 170.	1 or more, not claimed for 60 yrs.
197. Melton Mowbray.	Unknown.	Unknown.		Ca.£600.	Boys and Girls Schools, boys have High and Low Schools. Boys of town (High 100 now, Low 60). Now almost entirely 3 R's.	Master takes boarders, usually about 10.	Free.	Boarders £25 p.a.	£63 nett, House and Close.	As under (8).	160.	2 possible. (not how used?)
LINCOLN:-												
198. Alford.	Ca.1565	P.	P.	£192.15.0. nett.	Recently opened to whole population "to learn alphabet" - boarders then taken away.	None now.	Free.		£100 and House.			2, and 1 shared.
199. Boston.	1554.	Cr.	Co. (Munic.) (Add to salary).	?		Master takes P.P.		P.P. £34.	£120, no House.	As under (8).		
200. Butterwick.	1665.	P.		£250.								
201. Caistor.	1630.	P.		Ca. £190.	Any no. from anywhere. (Chiefly Engl. educ. now)	No boarders at present.	Free.		£130, no House.	Is usually Vicar.	30-40 boys & girls.	1, but none sent for many years.
202. Gainsborough.	Temp. Eliz.	P?	P.		No longer any Foundation (exc. for a 3 R's school).	Day boys (14 or 15), and Boarders (Ca. 40).		Day boys 6 gns. Boarders 40 gns.	£30 and House.	As under (8).	55 Ca.	None? Many go to Univs.
203. Glanford Bridge.	1669.	P.		£340 plus £12 and some livings.	Total 80 - certain Parishes for Grammar; from anywhere for 3 R's. Chosen by Master.	Master takes boarders, Usher do. for Engl. educ.	Free.	Boarders 34 gns.	£240, and House, but less maintenance of 2 free scholars.	As under (8).	80?	None, but many go.
204. Grantham.	Refd. 1553.	Cr.	P.	At least £800.	Sons of residents in or within 1 mile of Grantham (now 12).	Boarders taken by Master. (now 9).	Free.	Boarders 40 gns.	£150 and House.	As under (8).	12.	6 - 10, and preference to 4.
205. Grimsby.	1547.	Cr.	P.	Ca. £157.	70 boys, Sons of Freemen.	About 10 day boys, undefined. No P.P.	Free.	Day boys?	Salary & Endowments £200.		Ca.80.	None.
206. Holbeach.		P.	P.	£138.								
207. Horncastle.	1571.	P.		Precarious- were £199.5. in 1817.		No boarders.			£40.			
208. Laceby, Nr. Grimsby.	1720.	P.		£150 +	Poor boys and girls of 3 places for 3 R's.	Master takes P.P.	Free		£50.			None?
209. Lincoln.	2 united 1565.				Cath. and Corp. Schools united.	Master declines giving information.						

SCHOOL	(1). DATE OF FOUNDN.	(2) ORIG. END.BY	(3) ADD. END.BY	(4) AMT.END.IN 1817-18 (Ca.)	(5) NATURE OF FOUNDATION.	(6) NON-FOUNDATIONERS.	(7) AVERAGE EXPENSES OF FOUNDATIONERS.	(8) AVERAGE EXP. OF NON-FOUND.	(9) MASTER'S SALARY.	(10) MASTER'S INC.FROM OTHER SOURCES.	(11) TOTAL NO. OF BOYS IN 1817-18.	(12) UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENTS.
LANCASHIRE (Contd.):-												
171. Burnley.	Before Edw. VI.	?	P.		Boys of Chapelry for Classics. (Ca 20).	Others for Engl. Educ. (30-40). No P.P.	Free.	3 gns. for Engl. educ. less to poor ch.	Ca. £130.	All surplus. Is also an assistant Curate.	50-60	None?
172. Bury.									£200.	About £20.		
173. Cartmel.	Unknown.	Paid by Parish.	P.		Undefined - partly Classical but mainly Commercial.	Master takes pupils.	Free. Wealthier give cockpence.	P.P. 2 gns. a month for board. 3 R's extra.	£172 - £182.	As under (7) & (8).		1 doubtful.
174. Chorley.	1611.	P. (Inhab.)	P.		None free.	All day boys pay. Master takes boarders. (Almost entirely commercial).		Boarders £25 - 30.	Total Ca. £120		Ca. 70.	
175. Clitheroe	Temp. Ph. & Mary.	Cr.			Free to world for Classics only.	Master takes pupils.	Free.	P.P. £50.	£200.	As under (8), and usually a living.		1 very rarely.
176. Farnworth, In. Widnes.	1507.	P.	P.	Ca. £56.16.0.								3?
177. Hawkshead.	1585.	P.			Boys of Parish.	Day boys from out of Parish; boarders board in village.	Free for Classics.	D.B. 2 gns. Boarders in village 22 gns.	Ca. £100 nett.	As under (8).	Ca. 50.	None.
178. Lancaster.	Medieval.	?	P.		Sons of Freemen.	All others (apparently no boarders) very reasonably. A few P.P. for Univs.	Free, but expected to give cockpennies.	30/- to 2 gns., day boys. (and cockpennies)	£70.	As under (7) & (8).	Ca. 65.	None.
179. Leyland, Nr. Chorley.	Unknown.	Unknown.		£3.17.10 from Rev. of D.of Lancaster; and some interest.								
180. Liverpool.				£10.13.3 from Cr. Land Revenues.	School discontinued since about 1808. To be revived by Corporation.							
181. Manchester.	1519-24.	P.	P.	Ca.£1600.	"No man-child refused."	All Masters take boarders; and High M. also 2 parlour boarders.	Free? exc.(orig.) 1d on entrance.	Boarders from 40 to 60 gns. P.B. 120 - 140 gns.	£420 and House.	As under (8).	170-180.	11, 32 shared.
182. Middleton.	1572.	P. Cr.	P.		Boys of Parish for Classics (very few).	Day boys and girls for Commercial educ., boarding available in town. Under Master uses Monitorial System.	Free.	24/- for Commercial educ.		As under (8).	Ca. 100?	13 very small, never claimed.
183. Prescot.	?	P. (Inhab).	P.	£40 incl. value of bdge. plus £65.(and some others).	33 poor boys (Engl. educ. only).	Day boys and boarders (pupils).	Free.	D.B. 4 gns. Boarders 35 gns.	Ca. £113, incl. value of House.	As under (8).	Ca. 63.	Preference to 7.
184. Preston.	?	Co? (Munic.)	P.		Boys from anywhere, for Classics.	Master takes 2 P.P.	Free, but presents given at Shrovetide.	P.P. on "liberal terms."	Ca. £100.	As under (7)& (8).		None.
185. Rivington, Nr. Bolton.	1566.	P.		Ca. £4CO.	"all our faithfull and leige people", but preference given to 6 townships.	No pupils or boarders.	Free.		£100 and House.			None?
186. Rochdale.	1565.	P.		Ca.£39.14.0.	Boys of Parish for Latin and true Piety. (more now, as a few do Latin but also Engl.)	All others. No boarders at present.	(Free).	D.B. 6 gns.	£34.14.0 and £3 not now paid.	As under (8).	Ca. 30.	2 shared.
187. Whalley.	Temp. Edw.VI.	Cr.	P.	£43.18.8?	Boys of Parish for Classics.	Master takes pupils.	Free.	P.P. £30.	£70 - 80 altogether.	As under (8).		13 shared.
188. Wigan.	Before 1619.	?	P.		80 sons of inhabitants.	Boarders taken by Master.	Free.	Boarders 50 gns.	£130.	As under (8).	Ca.80?	None.
189. Winwick, Nr. Warrington.	Ca. Temp. Eliz.	P.	P.	£34?	Boys of town and Parish for Classics.	Master takes about 50 boarders.						None.

SCHOOL	(1) DATE OF FOUNDN.	(2) ORIG. END.BY	(3) ADD. END.BY	(4) AMT.END.IN 1817-18 (ca.)	(5) NATURE OF FOUNDATION	(6) NON-FOUNDATIONERS	(7) AVERAGE EXPENSES OF FOUNDATIONERS.	(8) AVERAGE EXP. OF NON-FOUND.	(9) MASTER'S SALARY.	(10) MASTER'S INC.FROM OTHER SOURCES.	(11) TOTAL NO. OF BOYS IN 1817-18	(12) UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENTS.
KENT:-												
151. Ashford.	1632.	P.		£30 (retained in hands of founder's fam-Knatchbull)	Boys of town of Ashford (now 3 - 6).	Any. Gentlemen's sons sometimes nearly 100.	Free.	40 gns. for board and educ.	£30	As under (8), and this one has a Rectory.	?	None.
152. Biddenden, Nr. Cranbrook.	1522.	P.			Poor boys of Parish (now 10)	Not defined - "day scholars.	Free.	3d or 6d per week.	Orig. about £15 nett.	As under (8).	30.	None.
153. King's School, Canterbury.	1542.	Cr.	P.(Ann: coll. by old boys)	Add. end. (collection) brings in about £50. Also capital accnt. of £1300.	50 from anywhere in Kingdom.	H.M. takes boarders.	?	45 gns. for boarders.	"Small stipend from Cathedral Revenues" and House.	As under (8)	70.	17, and others open.
154. Charing.	1761.	P.		Capital £2650.	Poor boys & girls of Parish. (10 boys, 10 girls).	H.M. takes boarders.	Free.	22 gns. p.a. for boarders.	£33.	As under (8).	75 (incl. girls.)	2 for Parish. (School not Classical)
155. Cranbrook.	1574.	P.		£135?	Boys of Parish.	H.M. takes boarders.	Free.	50 gns. for boarders.	£100	As under (8).	?	2 (shared with Warwick.)
156. Faversham	1576	Cr.			Boys within 5 miles of town, any no.	H.M. takes boarders. (now 15).	Free?	?	?	This one also Vicar of F.	?	1 doubtful.
157. Goudhurst.	1670	P.			(2 schools - 1 classical, 1 for poor - all nominated by Trustees from Parish. no. not stated).	No others.	Free.		£35. (£5 to teacher of poor school).	Present Master has a living in Kent.	? (12 in poor school).	None.
158. Lewisham.	1647.	P.		?	Chosen from a no. of Parishes, 31 in Classical school (plus one son of each incumbent) and 31 in English school.	Masters of both schools take private pupils.	Free.	?	?	?	?	7 endowed, but not paid, neither school being classical.
159. Maidstone.	Cal562.	Co. (Munic.)	P.		Sons of Freemen, no limit (to learn Classics only).	Master takes boarders. (now has 20 - 30).	Free.	40 gns for boarders.	£31 and House.	As under (8).	?	2 (Univ. Oxford).
160. Royal Grammar Sch., Rochester.	1542.	Co. (Dean and Chapter.)	P.		Now "a perfectly private instn., under sole control of Dean & Chapter".							6.
161. New Romney.	1618.	P.			2 poor children (not classical) also hospital for 2 poor couples.	No others.	Free.		?	?	2	None.
162. Sandwich.	1563.	P and Co. (Munic).	P.		Children of Inhabitants of Sandwich.	Any no. of "forreine schollers". M. also has 5 - 8 boarders P.P.	Free (orig., but now 8 gns?)	8 gns., day sch.	Orig. £50, not regularly paid.	Fees from P.P. and Day sch., (and Found?)	?	4.
. Sevenoaks.	1418 Refounded 1560.	P.	P.		Inhabitants?	Not defined.			£50, House and garden.			8.
.. Sutton Valence, . Maidstone.	1578.	P.	P.	£45?	30 boys of this and 4 neighbouring Parishes, ages 7 - 14. Educ. according to desire of parents.	No others.	Free.		£30.		30	2, seldom claimed
165. Tenterden	Before 1521.	P.	P.		As many children of Parish as Mayor and Jurats think proper.	No others.	Free.					
166. Tunbridge.	1552.	P.	P.		Children of town and Parish.							14 Sch., and exh., 1 Fellowship & 1 Bible Clerkship at St. John's Oxford and others open.
167. Wye.	Refounded 1630.	Cr. and P.	P.									1.
LANCASHIRE:-												
168. Blackburn.	Temp. Eliz.	Cr.	P.		All the world.	No boarders or P.P.	Free except entrance.		£90.	Small and uncertain perquisites.	60-70.	None?
169. Blackrod, Nr. Bolton.	Author does not know.											1.
170. Bolton.	1641.	P.							£80 or more.			

SCHOOL	(1) DATE OF FOUNDN.	(2) ORIG. END.BY	(3) ADD. END.BY	(4) AMT.END.IN 1817-18 (Ca).	(5) NATURE OF FOUNDATION	(6) NON-FOUNDATIONERS	(7) AVERAGE EXPENSES OF FOUNDATIONERS	(8) AVERAGE EXP. OF NON.FOUND.	(9) MASTER'S SALARY.	(10) MASTER'S INS.FROM OTHER SOURCES.	(11) TOTAL NO.OF BOYS IN 1817-18	(12). UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENTS.
HEREFORD (Contd.):-												
133. Colwall Green, Nr. Ledbury.	1612.	P.			All poor children of Colwall, 7 from Little Malvern, 4 poor, rels. of Founder. At present Master has left, Usher refuses to admit the Foundn.	No others mentioned.	Free.		£30 (sinecure).			None.
134. Hereford.	1583.	Cr.	P.		Sons of Citizens, if poor pay only 5/- entrance and the rest at their own will. If not poor, 20/- p.a. 11 are now free - 7 nominated by Canons as Choristers, 4 by Dean.	"Foreigners" at Master's discretion. About 50 boarders and 50 day boys.	See under (5).	Boarders 30 gns. Day boys 4 gns.	£20 and House.	As under (8). This one also has a Vicarage.	111?	2, and 32 shared with 2 other schools. 1 open.
135. Kington.	1620.	P.	P.	£270.	Boys of Parish and 3 neighbouring Chapelries, for Classics.	Occasionally, not usually, a few boarders.	Entrance only, according to Social status.		£202.10.0., and House.			None.
136. Kinnersley.				£6.2.0 of Cr. Land Revenues.	Author knows nothing else.							
137. Ledbury.	Temp. Reformation.	?		£3.11.3 Cr. Land Revenues.	4 Boys of town and Parish (now Engl. Educ. only.)	40 - 80 others, undefined. (Engl. only).	Free.	£1.16.0 p.a.	£3.11.3 and House.	As under (8).	44 - 84.	None.
138. Lucton, Nr. Leominster.	1708.	P.	P.		From specified parishes: 50 whose parents have not land of more than £100 p.a., orig £20., (Free) 30 do. not more than £300 p.a., orig. £60., (20/- p.a., orig. 10/- p.a.) (Monitorial system now. Not Classical?)	Master may take 20 pupils.	Free or 20/- (see 5).	P.P. £33.	£120 and House.	As under (8), and has a Chapel.	80?	1 every 2 yrs.
HERTFORD:-												
139. St.Alban's.	1553.	Cr.	Cr.,P.	£171.4.0.	120 from anywhere. Classics only, "poor men's children before others."	Master takes pupils - private if over 16, if under learn in the school ("a few").	4d per quarter if townsmen, 12d from elsewhere.	50 gns.under 16, from 100 gns, if over.(P.P.)	Originally £20.	As under (8), and usually a Rectory.	16 - 28.	None.
140. Aldenham.	1599.	P.		54 acres.	60, first the sons of poor of Parish, end of Freemen of Brewer's Co., then, (if room), neighbouring Parishes. (Engl. educ. only).	Master takes 2 or 3 pupils.	10d entrance.	P.P. 30 gns.	£120 less Usher's salary & board.	As under (8).	60?	None.
141. Chipping Barnet.	1573.	Cr?										
142. Berkhampstead.	1524.				144, apparently of Parish; recently there was only 1 scholar.	Master takes a few pupils.						None.
143. Buntingford.	Before 1633.	P.	P.	£17.12.0	5 on orig., 4 on later endt.	Master takes pupils, Classical and other.		Board 40 gns. Instr. according to subject. (Classical 20 gns.)		As under (8).		4.
144. Hertford Grammar School.	1617	P.			Not defined; at present about 40. Orig. only Classics provided, now English and Commercial educ. chiefly wanted.	Master takes about 30 boarders.	Free.	25 - 30 gns. for boarders.	£20.	As under (8).	70.	?. None now claimed because Comm. educ. wanted.
145. East India College School, Hertford.	1806	Co.		Resources of E.I.Co. behind it.	Pupils who are to be prepared for E.I. College.	"The public at large". Master also takes pupils.		P.P. 50 & 70 gns. and extras.	None but House. (Hertford Castle.)	As under (8).		Connection with E.I. College.
146. Stanstead Abbots, Nr. Hoddesdon.	1630.	P.							£20 and some voluntary contributions and House.			Not Classical now - None.
147. Stevenage.	1558	P.			None now on Foundation.	Undefined, but "at expense of their friends". Engl. educ. only. About 50.			£13.6.8.		50	None.
148. Bishop's Stortford.					No longer exists.							
HUNTINGDON:-												
149. Godmanchester.	Temp. Eliz.	Cr.			Children of Freemen of Borough (now Engl. educ. only).	"Usually about 20 other boys". Master may take any no.	Free.	?	£28.13.6. and House.			None.
150. Huntingdon.	Ancient.		P.		Natives of town, for Classics.	Residents, not Natives (Day boys), and boarders.	Free.	Day boys 6 gns. Boarders 35 gns,	£25, House, and 5 acres.	As under (8). This one also a Living.	Ca. 40	1.

SCHOOL	(1) DATE OF FOUNDN.	(2) ORIG. END.BY.	(3) ADD. END.BY.	(4) AMT.END.IN 1817-18 (ca.)	(5) NATURE OF FOUNDATION.	(6) NON-FOUNDATIONERS.	(7) AVERAGE EXPENSES OF FOUNDATIONERS.	(8) AVERAGE EXP. OF NON.FOUND.	(9) MASTER'S SALARY.	(10) MASTER'S IND.FROM OTHER SOURCES.	(11) TOTAL NO.OF BOYS IN 1817-18	(12) UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENTS.
GLOUCESTER (Contd.):-												
113. Chipping Sodbury.	Before 1679.		P.						(Orig. £30.)			
114. Tetbury.	Temp. Jas.I.	P.		Now insignificant.	Ceased to exist, because of inadequacy of revenue.(Advowson & Tolls.)							
115. Tewkesbury.	1625	P.		(Orig. £20.)								
116. Thornbury.	A u t h o r k n o w s n o t h i n g o f i t.											
117. Wickwar.	1685.	P.							£28.			
118. King's School, Winchcombe.	'Ancient'			£10 out of Crown Land Revenues.	Boys of Parish, usually more than 20.	No others mentioned.	Free.				20 - 30?	None?
119. Frances 'Lady Chandos' Free School, Winchcombe.	1622.	P.		£52.	Orig. 14, actually 20 - 24 of Parish, now 3 R's only. (actually nomin. by Master).	No others mentioned.	Free.				20 - 24.	None?
120. Wotton-Under-Edge.	1385.	P.		£300 - £400.	Boys of town and Parish, free; 10 of them are on Foundation and get £6 per. a. - these nomin. alternately by Patron and Trustees. (12 - 14 others). Engl. Educ. preferred.	Master takes boarders and Parlour Boarders.	Free. (and 10 get £6.)	Boarders 30 gns. P.B. 50 gns.	£80 and House.	As under (8).	22 - 24.	2. Not many go.
HAMPSHIRE:-												
121. Alresford.	1698.	P.		Ca. 51 acres.	22 from 4 places (6,5,7 and 4) nomin. by Trustees.	Master evidently takes pupils.	Free?					None?
122. Alton.	1641.	P.			20 (of Parish?) Has declined lately in Status.	Assistant takes a few Day Sch., otherwise none.	Free.	"Very moderate."	Orig. £20.	Master has a living, is a sinecurist.		None?
123. Andover.	1569.	P.	P.		Boys of town, any no.	Any others, Day Boys; and Master takes boarders.	2 gns. p.a.	Day boys 8 gns. Boarders 30 gns.	£20.	As under (8).		None.
124. Basingstoke.	Early in temp. Henry VIII	P.	P.	Orig. 105 acres, £31 p.a. int. on £80.	Anyone for Classics, slight advantage to boys of town. (all free for Classics) Ages 6 - 16.	Masters don't take pupils - boys out of Parish pay more for English Educ.	Parish, £3 for Engl. Educ.	Non-Parish, 4 gns. for Engl.educ.	Variable.	As under (8).	20 - 30.	None.
125. Godshill, I.W.	1615.	P.	P.		Now free for 3 R's only. (Parish).	Master takes P.P. - these are all that do Grammar.	Free.	?	£17? and House.		30.	None.
126. Gosport. (see P.442 for Naval Academy).		P.			Ceased to exist, mid C.18.							
127. Newport, I.W.	1618.	(Public Subscr.)		£150 +	15 boys of town, sent by Mayor. (Ages 7/8 - 15). Classical boys go to Eton or Winchester at 10 or 11.	Other day boys (50), and Master takes pupils.	Free.	P.P. £28 p.a.	£154. and House & Garden.	As under (8).	65.	None.
128. Portsmouth.	1732.	P.		£200	Probably will be 20 boys, sons of Burgesses.	All others, Day boys. Master does not take Boarders.	Free.	Day boys, 8 gns.	£80 and House.	As under (8).	Ca. 80?	None.
129. Southampton.	1553.	Cr. (Founded only).	P.		As many Poor Men's sons of town as Corporation chooses. (None now).	All others. Master evidently takes boarders.	Free.	Boarders? Day boys £1. and entrance.	£28.5.0 and House.	As under (8).		None.
130. Winchester.	1382.	P.	P.		70 Scholers (and others) nominated in turn by the 6 electors (but 2 Founder's Kin elected by majority).	Commoners from anywhere.	Average about £80 p.a. (only £19.13.6 to College).	£64.8.0 to Master; and Bills.			Ca. 200.	Whole of New Coll. and others.
HEREFORD:-												
131. Bosbury.	Before Eliz.	P.	Cr. P.		Boys of Parish, for Classics. Present master gives freely Engl. Educ. to 10.	About 10 or 15 others, undefined. Master takes boarders.	Free.	Boarders £25.	£60 - 70.	As under (8).	20 - 25.	1 open.
132. Bromyard.	Temp. Eliz.	Cr.	P.		Children of town - very few attend.	No others mentioned.	Free.		£36.14.11½	No other. But has a Curacy.		

SCHOOL	(1) DATE OF FOUNDN.	(2) ORIG. END.BY	(3) ADD. END.BY.	(4) AMT.END. IN 1817-18 (ca).	(5) NATURE OF FOUNDATION.	(6) NON-FOUNDATIONERS.	(7) AVERAGE EXPENSES OF FOUNDATIONERS.	(8) AVERAGE EXP. OF NON- FOUND.	(9) MASTER'S SALARY.	(10) MASTER'S INC.FROM OTHER SOURCES.	(11) TOTAL NO.OF BOYS IN 1817-18.	(12) UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENTS.
DURHAM (Contd.):-												
93. (Kepyer Sch.) Houghton le Spring, Nr. Durham	1574.	Cr.			None.	All admitted by Master.(He also takes 30 P.P.)		P.P. 50 &ns. others at discretion.		As under (2).		None. (12 possible)
94. Sedgefield.				5 acres and £2.12.0.	6 poor children.		Free.					(12 possible)
ESSEX:-												
95. Braintree.	1702	P.			10 poor children of the town to learn English and Latin in parish school. (Was this an add. endt?).							Some open.
96. Brentwood.	1557.	P.			Boys 8 - 18, living within 3 miles of school, who can read and write; Master and Wardens can limit no.	No others.	Free.				60 - 70.	1 shared with 2 other Schools.
97. Chelmsford.	1552.	Cr.	P.		Boys of town and neighbourhood at discretion of Trustees (now 20).	Others not defined (now 15). Also, M. takes private pupils.	Free.	P.P. 30 gns. Day boys?		As under (5).	35.	1 shared with 2 other schools.
98. Chigwell.	1629.	P. (abp.)		More than £70?	2 Schools, Latin and English. Latin: 12 from Chigwell, 6 from other specified Parishes. English: any no. from Chigwell, 6 from other specified Parishes.	Elsewhere. Latin School now has 3 or 4 on Found., 26 or 27 others. English: 20 Chigwell, 6 others. (as under (5)).	Free.	[illegible]	£20 (Latin) £50 (English)		56.	None?
99. Colchester.	1584.	Cr.	P.	£117.	16 Free Scholars (presumably of the town).	Not stated. Total no. of scholars 30 - 40, and some are day sch. Master and Assistant take P.P.	Free.	Day boys 10 gns. Master's P.P. 80-120 gns. Assistant's 60 gns.		As under (5).	30 - 40.	1 and 2 open.
100.Dedham.	Endowed 1571.	P.	P.		20 scholars, such as Governors should approve.							2.
101.Earl's Colne, Nr. Halstead.	Temp. Henry VIII	P.		£175.1.0.	30 boys from Parishes where estates lie, provided parents are poor.	Others unspecified (now about 16). Master takes 6 P.P.	Free.	P.P. 25 gns. p.a.	£165.1.0.	As under (8).	46.	None.
102. Felsted.	1564.	P.	P.	More than £96.	80 boys born in Essex. Control and patronage in heirs of Founder.	Not specified.			£64. and House.			None.
103. Halstead.	1594.	P.		Orig.£20.	43 from 2 parishes, failing which 40 from within 8 miles. Controlled by Governors of Christ's Hosp., London.							
104. Maldon.	1608.	P.	P.	Orig. about £100.	Endowment is of a Public Library as well as a School.							1.
105. Newport, Nr. Bishop's Stortford.	1588.	P.		£275 ca.	50 from Parish, or (failing these) elsewhere, ages 6 - 13,(ca). Governor is Master of Caius. Feoffees nominate to vacancies on Foundation.	No others. Master may not take pupils.	Free.		£205.			Preference to some at Caius: (2 sch.& 6 F.)
106. Saffron Walden	1525.	P.	P. Cr?		All children born in this & 3 other Parishes. (now 140).	No others specified.	Free. (1d entrance).		£32.P.O and House.		140.	None. (evidently not classical now).
GLOUCESTER:-												
107. Chipping Campden.	1487.	P.	P.	£184.	Boys of Parish, for Classics. Admitted by ticket signed by 3 of Resident Trustees (30 - 40).	Master takes lit. no. of pupils.	Free.	£30 for P.P.	£50 and House.	As under (8).	30-40	1 in 4 yrs.
108. Cheltenham.	1574.	P.	P.									1 in 4 yrs.
109. Cirencester.	1608.	P.	P.	£20 from Cr. Land Revenues.					£20 and House.			
110. Cathedral or College School, Gloucester.	Co-eval with Abbey.		P.		6 Chorister boys. Classics (unless parents object) and English.	Others usually P.P. (25 - 30).	Free.		More than £20 and House.	P.P., and Living at disposal of Dean & Chapter.		1 in 4 yrs.
111. Grammar Sch. of St. Mary de Crypt, Gloucester.	1528.	P.	P.		Apparently none now.	All are paying pupils.			(Orig. £20.)	As under (6).		2.
112. Northleach.	1559.	P.		£600 and 117 acres.	Boys of town and 1 other Parish. Classics only. (hence only 3 now).	No boarders now taken.	Free, except entrance.				3.	1 in 4 yrs?

SCHOOL	(1) DATE OF FOUNDN.	(2). ORIG. END.BY.	(3) ADD. END.BY.	(4) AMT.END.IN 1817-18 (ca).	(5) NATURE OF FOUNDATION	(6) NON-FOUNDATIONERS	(7) AVERAGE EXPENSES OF FOUNDATIONERS	(8) AVERAGE EXP. OF NON-FOUND.	(9) MASTER'S SALARY.	(10) MASTER'S INC. FROM OTHER SOURCES.	(11) TOTAL NO. OF BOYS IN 1817-18.	(12) UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENTS.
CUMBERLAND (contd):-												
54. Plumbland, Nr. Cockermouth.	1798.	P.		£80.	Boys and girls of Parish, for Classics or Engl. (ca. 45).	Undefined (ca. 45) and Master takes pupils.	Free.	Day B.? P.P. 28 gns.	£40.	As under (8). and this one has a Curacy.	Ca. 90. Boys & Girls.	None?
55. Thursby, Nr. Carlisle.	Ca. 1740.	Fd. by inhab., without endt.	P.		Boys and girls of Parish (very few do Classics - essentially 3 R's.)		Quarterpence.		£25.	Has Curacy.	Ca. 40.	None?
56. Uldale, Nr. Keswick.	1726.	P.	P. (inhab.)	£31.9.0.	Children of subscribers, and of such poor persons as Trustees think fit.	None mentioned.	Free.				Ca. 50.	None?
57. Whitcham and Millom, nr. Bootle.	Before 1540	?	None.		Children of 2 Parishes.		Quarterage, 16/- p.a. or 64/- p.a.		Total about £50. 0.0.			None.
58. Wigton, Nr. Carlisle.	1730	P.	P.	£70.	Children of subscribers, and 2 others. (sons)	All others. Master takes a few pupils.	Free.	D.B. 4 gns. P.P. 30 gns.	£42. and House.	As under (8).	70-80.	
59. Wreay, Nr. Carlisle.	Temp. Reformation.	P.	P.		All indefinitely.		Free?		Total ca. £35.			
DERBY:-												
60. Ashborne.	1585.	P.	P.	Ca. £180?	Boys of Parish for Latin.	Master takes boarders.	Free.	Boarders 35 gns.	£160 and House.	As under (8).		2 very rarely.
61. Chesterfield.	Temp. Eliz.	P.	P.		Boys of town - but few go.	Master may, but doesn't take pupils.	Free.		£40 and House.			None in practice.
62. Derby.	12th Cent.	P?	P.	(a Corporation secret)	Sons of Burgesses - actually 3 or 4.	Pay boys (3 or 4).	Free.	4 gns. p.a. 1 gn. ent.	£70.	£20 for a sermon.	72	10 shared, and others indefinitely.
63. Dronfield.	1579	P.		Ca. £230	Boys of Parish - now English educ. only. (Monitorial system).	Master doesn't take pupils.	Free.		£130 and House.			None.
64. Hartshorn, Nr. Ashby de la Z.	1626	P.		£50.	30 Boys of Parish, now Engl. educ. only.	Undefined.	Free.		£30 and House.		40-70.	None?
65. Repton.	1557.	P.		£2,500 ca. (Hospital & School)	Undefined (18 at present).	Master & Usher take boarders.	Free.	M's. boarders, 54 gns. Usher's 30gns.	Ca. £200 and House.	As under (8). A small Vicarage sometimes.		4.
66. Risley.	Ca. 1593.	P.	P.	Ca. £300?	2 schools, Classical & Engl., both free to a no. of Parishes.	M's deputy and Engl. master both take boarders.	Free.	Boarders £5 & 20 gns.	£200 and House.	As under (8).	Ca.17-18. Eng.106	None.
67. Wirksworth.	Ca.1575.	P.	P.	Ca. £180.	Boys of Parish for Classics. (60 - 70).	Master takes P.P. (has ca. 30).	Free.	Boarders ca. 30.	£45 and House.	As under (8).	60 - 70?	None?
DEVON:-												
68. Blundell's, Ashburton. (Not the Blundell's)		P.		£50.	Boys of town and Parish.	A few from neighbouring Parishes occasionally. No boarders.	Free.		£50.			
69. Barnstaple.	Ancient?	?	P.		1 boy, recomm. by Mayor and Corp.	Master takes unlimited no. of pupils.						
70. Bideford.	Before 1657.	?	P.	£56 and House worth £35.	3, nomin., by Trustees.	Others undefined, usually 20 - 40.	Free.	?	£50. House, etc.		23-43.	None.
71. Chudleigh.	1669	P.			Parishioners, now only 2 or 3.						2 - 3.	
72. Crediton.	1547.	Cr.	Cr.	£5,086.5.8. (1809). not all for school.	Boys of Parish.	Day boys (now 1) & Boarders (27).	£5 p.a., but 10 get burtaries.	Boarders 40 gns. Day Boys ?	£50 and House.	As under (v) & (a), and a living £190.	Ca. 48.	3.

SCHOOL	(1). DATE OF FOUNDN.	(2) ORIG. END.BY.	(3) ADD. END.BY.	(4) AMT.END IN 1817-18 (ca).	(5) NATURE OF FOUNDATION	(6) NON-FOUNDATIONERS	(7) AVERAGE EXPENSES OF FOUNDATIONERS	(8) AVERAGE EXP. OF NON-FOUND.	(9) MASTER'S SALARY.	(10) MASTER'S INC.FROM OTHER SOURCES.	(11) TOTAL NO.OF BOYS IN 1817-18	(12) UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENTS.
DEVON (Contd.):-												
73. Gr.Sch. & Engl. Sch., Exeter. (Hosp.of St.John Baptist.)	Ref. Henry VIII.	Re-grant by Cr?	P.		Grammar Sch. & English Sch. or Blue Sch. (£1 in latter). Endt. of Gr : Sons of Freemen. (Now 10).	Master takes boarders (22).	Day boys 8 gns.	Boarders 30 gns.	£40 and House.	As under (8).	32.	Ca. ??
74. High School, Exeter.	1343.	?			Now consolidated with Gr. School?							
75. Honiton				£12.	3 boys, one from each of 3 Parishes. Chosen by Feoffees.	50-60 others undefined.	Free?	Boarders £30.	No salary, but House.	(8), and profits from Chapel.	50-60.	None.
76. Kingsbridge.	1689	P.	P.	£15.	15 boys, town having preference.	Boarders (and Day sch.?) (now 2 or 3).	Free.	Maximum about £41.	£15. and House.	As under (8).	Ca. 20?	Indef. no., but never claimed.
77. Ottery St. Mary.	Refd. 1545.	Cr.	P.		2 Free boys chosen by Trustees; Natives of Parish.	Other day boys & boarders (8?) (48). (ages 8 - 18).	Free.	Day Boys £10. Boarders 50 gns.	"Very Considerable"	As under (8).	55?	1
78. Plymouth.	Temp. Henry VII.	Co. (Munic)	P.		Poor Sons of Freemen, chosen by Corp. (now 2).	Master takes boarders.	Free.	Boarders 32 gns.	£70 and House.	As under (8).		Occasional.
79. Plympton	Ca.1653.	P.		£168 or £250?	Boys of Parish? (now 2).	Master takes boarders.	Free.	Boarders £40.	Whole of endt.	As under (8).		None.
80. Blundell's Tiverton.	1599.	P.		Orig. endt. now £400.and int.on £2670. Plus later addt.	150, with preference to town and Parish?	Master and Usher take boarders.	Free, or 4 or 5 gns?	Day boys 4 or 5 gns. Boarders this plus £30.	£50 (and House?)	As under (8).	230	About 17.
81. Totnes.	1554	Co. (Munic.)			Boys of town (2 free, chosen by Corp.)	Master takes a few boarders.	2 Free, rest 6 gns.	Boarders £6.				None.
DORSET:-												
82. Blandford.	Before 1579.				No longer any Foundation.	Master evidently conducts a private school, pays rent for School House.						
83. Cranborne.					No longer exists.							
84. Dorchester	1579	P.		£53.	12 now on Foundation (free to townsmen)	Master can take 60 Boarders. (at present 10?)	3 gns.	£42 and extras (for boarders).	£53 and House, but pays taxes on it.	As under (8).	Ca.?29	1, and 2 shared.
85. Evershot, nr. Sherborne	1628	P.		£145.	All born in Parish, all Founder's Kin, and 4 others.		Free.					None?
86. Gillingham, Nr. Shaftesbury.	1598	?	P.	88 acres. nearly £200.	Boys of Village (now 18, 3 R's only).		Free.		£40 and House.			None?
87. Milton Abbas.	1521	P.	P.		Recently moved to Blandford, and thereby destroyed.							
88. Shaftesbury.	?	?			Endowed school has disappeared.	Master evidently has pte. school, paying rent for House. (cf. Blandford.)						
89. Sherborne.	Refd. 1551	Cr.	P.			Master takes private pupils.		P.P. 35 gns.	£100 and House.			None.
90. Wimborne Minster.	1510 (Refd 1563).	P. (Refd. Cr.)			"All who shall come for instruction".	Master takes pupils.	Free.	P.P. 30 gns.	£34 and House.	As under (8).		None?
DURHAM:-												
91. Darlington	1567	Cr.			Boys of town and Parish for Classics. (ca 60).	Master takes 4 B.P.		P.P. 30 - 40 gns.	Nearly £200.	As under (8).	60	None. (12 possible).
92. Durham.	1541	Cr?			18 poor boys.							3 shared. 12 possible.

SCHOOL	(1) DATE OF FOUNDN.	(2) ORIG. END.BY	(3) ADD. END.BY	(4) AMT.END.IN 1817-18.(ca).	(5) NATURE OF FOUNDATION	(6) NON-FOUNDATIONERS	(7) AVERAGE EXPENSES OF FOUNDATIONERS	(8) AVERAGE EXP. OF NON-FOUND.	(9) MASTER'S SALARY	(10) MASTER'S INC. FROM OTHER SOURCES.	(11) TOTAL NO. OF BOYS IN 1817-18	(12) UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENTS.
CAMBRIDGE:-												
15. Cambridge. (Perse)	1615	P.	P.		Natives of Cambridge or 3 other places, not exceeding 100 total.	No others mentioned.	Free.		£43.		100?	Preference to 12.
16. Ely.	1541	Cr.							£18. and house.			
17. Wisbech	1548	Cr.	P.		Residents of town, for Classics. Most want Engl. educ., and must pay for that. (Nos. 10 - 20).	Master has Boarders. (Now 24).	Free.(Classics)	Boarders 35 gns.	£92. and house.	As under (8), also an extra £5.8.0	Ca.40.	2.
CHESHIRE:-												
18. Audlem, Nr. Nantwich.	1655	P.		£40 (incl. £20 pd. by Merchant Taylors.)					(orig. £30)			
19. Chester.	1544	Cr.		£32 + (charged on Revs. of Chapter.)	24 Boys appointed by Dean and Chapter.	Master may take 6 pupils.	Free?		£22 +	Master has a living and a prebend.		None?
20. Congleton.	Not later than Eliz.	P?	P.		"Boys of neighbourhood" - none free. Sons of Freemen don't pay extra for Classics.	Master takes 12 boarders.	About £3.	Boarders 40 gns.	None now, but house. (usually £17.)	As under (8).	Ca.70.	None.
21. Daresbury, Nr. Frodsham.	Ca.1560	P.		Int. on £185.								
22. Frodsham.	Ca.1660	P.	P.						£100+			
23. Hargrave, Nr. Chester.	1627.	P.	P.	£30.	Children of neighbourhood. 3 R's only.		Free for reading, £1.2.0. wr.& ar.		£30?			None.
24. Knutsford.	Before Reformation.	P.			6 nomin. by heir of Founder.	Boys of Parish indefinitely. Master takes 40 boarders now.	Free.	Boarders 35 gns.	£150.	As under (8).	46-54.	None?
25. Lymm, Nr. Warrington.	1698.	P.		£142.	Free to children of Parish and 2 Manors. 3 R's only.		Free.		nearly £120		Ca.100 boys & girls.	None?
26. Macclesfield	1552.	Cr.		over £800.	Boys of Parish.	Master takes boarders.	Free (exc.books)	Boarders 35-40 gns.	£200. and house.	As under (8).		None - but many go.
27. Malpas.	End of C.17.	P. (Subscr.)			Children of Heirs of orig. subscribers.				£25, and house?			
28. Middlewich.	End of C.17.		P.	£11.10.0.	11 Boys of Parish.				£11.10.0?			
29. Stockport.	1487	P.	P?	Ca. £46.								
30. Tarvin, Nr. Chester.		P.		£21.	Each of 10 Trustees may send 2 boys of Parish.	Any others. Master takes boarders.	Free?	Boarders 30 gns.	£21? and house.	As under (8). And a Curacy (in 1 case)		None.
31. Wallasey	1657.	P.	P.	£35. and int. on £100.	Boys of Parish for 3 R's.							
32. Wilton, Nr. Northwich.	1558.	P.		Ca. £100.	Upper School for Gr., Lower for 3 R's. Ch. of Chapelry.	No boarders now, Master has day boys (10) mostly sons of Trustees. Usher has pupils for 3 R's.	Free.	Day Boys 4 gns. Usher's £1 or £2.	£80.	As under (8).	Ca.50-60?	None.

SCHOOL	(1) DATE OF FOUNDN.	(2) ORIG. END.BY.	(3) ADD. END.BY.	(4) AMT.END.IN 1817-18 (ca).	(5) NATURE OF FOUNDATION	(6) NON-FOUNDATIONERS	(7) AVERAGE EXPENSES OF FOUNDATIONERS	(8) AVERAGE EXP. OF NON-FOUND.	(9) MASTER'S SALARY.	(10) MASTER'S INC.FROM OTHER SOURCES.	(11) TOTAL NO. OF BOYS IN 1817-18.	(12) UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENTS.
CORNWALL:-												
33. Bodmin	Temp. Eliz.	Cr.			None.	Day boys (15) from town, and Boarders (25 now).		Day Boys 2 gns, Boarders £45.	?	(8) and is Chaplain of Gaol at £100.	40.	None.
34. St.Ives.	1639.	Cr?			Ceased to exist.							
35. Launceston	Temp. Eliz.	Cr.	P.	£17.13.3½d from Cr.Land Revenues, and £25.	5 nomin. by heir of one benefactor.	Day boys? Boarders not mentioned.					12-14	None.
36. Liskeard.	Unknown.			No endt. Corp. pays salary.	As many Sons of Freemen as Corp. recommends.		Free.		£100 and house.			
37. Penryn.	Temp. Eliz.	Cr.		£6.18.0 from Cr. Land Revenues.	3 Boys - school has ceased to exist.							
38. Saltash.	Temp. Eliz.	Cr.		£7 from Cr. Land Revenues.	Ceased to exist.							
39. Truro.	?	P.	P.		None free.	Ca.12 Boarders, rest day boys (total ca. 50).		Boarders £29.4.0	£50. (no House?)	As under (8).	Ca. 50.	2.
CUMBERLAND:-												
40. Grammar School, St. Bees.	1583.	P.	Cr.	Ca. £113?	Nominally boys of Cumberland & Westm. only, for Classics.	All others - Master takes pupils.	Offering at Shrovetide; up to 3 gns.	Same as found. P.P.35 gns. B.in town, £24.6.0.	£50 and house.	As under (7) & (8).	Ca. 60.	2 and 1 in 5 yrs.
41. College, St. Bees.	1817.	P.			Candidates for Holy Orders, too poor for Univ. Educ.							
42. Great Blencow Nr. Penrith.	1577.	P.		£196.	All the world for Classics.	Master takes pupils.	Free.	P.P. 30 gns.	£196.	As under (8).	30-80.	None.
43. Bromfield, Nr. Wigton.	1612	P.	P.	£39.	Children of Parish - very few Classics, mainly Engl. educ.		Free.		£39?	Is also Curate.	30-70.	None?
44. Burgh by Sands, Nr. Carlisle.					No endowment. Ceased to exist in 1786, recently revived - paid by parishioners.				£4.			
45. Carlisle.	Temp. Henry VIII	Cr.	P.	£40.	No foundationers. Dean and Chapter control.	All day boys.						2 possible.
46. Cockermouth.	1676.	P.			Boys of town for Classics (very few).	Boys of town for other subj., others undefined.			£25.			
47. Crosthwaite, Nr. Keswick.	Medieval?			£100.10.0.	Children of Parish (260, of whom only 6 do Classics).	No P.P.	Free.		£80.		260	None?
48. Culgaith and Blencarn. (nr. Penrith).	1775.	P.		£58.	Children of inhab. of 2 townships.	"Few". (undefined).	Free.		Total £40. 0.0.			
49. Dalston, Nr. Carlisle.	Before Chas.I.	?	P.		Children of Parish (very few do Classics).	Others undefined.	Small quarterage.	At discretion of Master.	Total £70 - £80.		60-90 Boys & Girls.	None?
50. Dean, Nr. Cockermouth.	1596.	P.	P.	£10.17.6.								
51. Hunsonby.	1726.	P.		£50.	Children of Township - 3 R's only now.				£50.			
52. Maughanby, Nr. Penrith.	1634.	P.		£70.	Boys and girls of Parish (almost entirely Engl. educ.)		Free.		£70.		30-40 Boys & Girls.	
53. Penrith.	Refounded 1564.	Cr.	P.		Boys of Parish.	Master takes pupils.	Quarterpence.	P.P. 35 gns.	£21.	As under (7) & (8).	30.	1 in 5 yrs.

SCHOOL	(1) DATE OF FOUNDN.	(2) ORIG. END.BY	(3) ADD. END.BY	(4) AMT.END.IN 1817-18 (Ca.)	(5) NATURE OF FOUNDATION	(6) NON-FOUNDATIONERS	(7) AVERAGE EXPENSES OF FOUNDATIONERS.	(8) AVERAGE EXP. OF NON-FOUND.	(9) MASTER'S SALARY	(10) MASTER'S INC.FROM OTHER SOURCES.	(11) TOTAL NO.OF BOYS IN 1817-18.	(12). UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENTS.
LINCOLN (Contd.):-												
210. Louth.	1552.	Cr.		Nearly £600.	Boys of Parish for Classics (now 35).	Boarders with Master and in other houses (46).	Free.	Boarders in town pay M. 8 gns. M's boarders?	Nearly £300, and House.	As under (8).	81.	1 shared.
211. Moulton.	1560.	P.			Any no., from anywhere - must read chapter of New Testament. (now 60).	Master takes boarders (8).	Free (except 4d entrance.)	Boarders £35 - 40.		As under (8).	60.	None?
212. New Sleaford.	1604.	P.	P.		Boys of a no. of Parishes (none now).	Master has a few pupils.		?	£24.		C.	None.
213. Spalding.	Temp. Chas.II.	P.	P.	£150.	Sons of householders in town and Parish, 8 years old and can read ch. of Old T.	No boarders taken.	Free.		£150 less all exp., and Usher's salary.	This one has a Chapelry, £30 p.a.		None.
214. Radcliffe's Stamford.	Ca. 1530.	P.	P.	£331.6.0.	Boys of Stamford and adjacent towns (now 36).	2nd Master takes boys under 12 as boarders.	Free.	2nd M's boarders, £21.	£331.6.0 less all exp.,and 2nd.Master's salary.(Also house.)		36.	Ca. 2, 1 shared, preference to 11.
215. Wainfleet.	1484.	P.		Ca. £29.	Inhabitants o 3 Parishes of Wainfleet, for Classics (only 2 now).	All others - entirely for Engl. educ.	Free.	Eng. Educ. £3.4.0.	Ca. £29. and House.	As under (8).	50-70.	None?
216. Wragby.	1636.	P.	P.		Sons of Parishioners paying rents under £10. (Not classical now) (5?).	Those with rents over £10. (15?). Also boarders.	Free, but 20/- p.a. for books etc.	20/- for Arith, 20/- for Books. Boarders 18 gns.			20?	None?
LONDON:-												
217. St. Paul's.	1509.	P.	P.	£5,300 p.a.	153 from anywhere.	No others.			£618 p.a. and House.		153?	9 specific, plus indef. no. paid out of Foundation But see C.ii 88.
218. Merchant Taylors'.	1561.	Co., P.(Bdg. only).		None.	250 from anywhere (not Jews).	No others.	In. £4-5 School fees, board £52.10. p.a.		£100 p.a. and House.	Quarterage Ca. £500, "and other emoluments".	250.	About 63 Fell. & Schol., and Exhib.
219. Mercers'.	Before 1447.	?	Co. (bought confisc. lands of old Chapel.) and P.		35 from anywhere.	No others.	Free.				35.	2. (School non-classical since 1804).
220. Charterhouse.	1611.	P.	P.	£22,000 p.a.	42 from anywhere.	Unlimited (now 170).	Schooling free.	Total £75-85.	£245 or less. House & Linen.	Share of boarders fees fixed by Govs.	212.	Unlimited, but confined to Foundationers.
221. Christ's Hospital.	1553.	Cr.	P, Cr.	£43,386 p.a.	1156 (incl. 80 girls), incl. "junior dept." at Hertford (416) app. by Governors.	No others.	Free.		£240.16.8 and House.	£52.10.0 for a lecture.	1156?	8, and 1 other possible.
222. Allhallows Barking.	1689.	P.			14 from Parish of Allhallows, 6 from P. of St. John, Wapping.	No limit. (now 20).	Free.		£20 and House.		40.	None.
MIDDLESEX:-												
223. Westminster.	1560	Cr.		Not distinct from Collegiate endt., of which School uses about £1,200 p.a.	40 K.S. (Chosen from all candidates by system of challenges).	Statutes allow 80 Town boys, but more are taken.	Tuition £24.3.0 p.a. Entrance 8 gns.	Do. for tuition. Board 5 gns. entrance, £50.5.0 p.a.	£39.6.8. and House.	Variable amt. from fees.	More than 120.	About 11 or 12.
224. Harrow.	1571.	P.	None.	£700-800 p.a.	All children of the Parish.	"As many as may be well taught", etc.	Tuition? 10 gns. p.a. plus 30 gns? (p.150).	School 20-30 gns. Board 125 gns.			About 300	4 (of orig. endowment.)
225. Highgate.	1562.	P.	P.	"More than" £166.	Poor of Highgate and neighbouring Parishes. (Maximum 40).	No others.	Free.		£120.	Nil from School.	40?	None (Not Classical now.)
226. Hampton.	1556.	P.	P.	About £232?	Children of Parish (restriction made by Governors).	No others.	Free.		£232.11.6.	Nil.	About 50.	None (Not Classical now).

SCHOOL	(1) DATE OF FOUNDN.	(2) ORIG. END.BY	(3) ADD. END.BY	(4) AMT.END.IN 1817-18(Ca.)	(5) NATURE OF FOUNDATION	(6) NON-FOUNDATIONERS	(7) AVERAGE EXPENSES OF FOUNDATIONERS	(8) AVERAGE EXP. OF NON-FOUND.	(9) MASTER'S SALARY.	(10) MASTER'S INC.FROM OTHER SOURCES.	(11) TOTAL NO. OF BOYS IN 1817-18.	(12) UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENTS.
MIDDLESEX (Contd.):-												
227.Enfield.	1507.	P.		More than £105.	Children of Parish (Governors now strict, formerly lax in observing this).	No others.	Free.	(Formerly boarders taken, not now).	£100.	Nil.	104.	None (Not Classical
MONMOUTH:-												
228. Abergavenny.	1543.	Cr.			Natives of town and Parish, any no., for Classics. (Now few; part converted to Nat. school for majority).	A few for sake of Univ. Endt.; no boarders.	Free, except books.	Day boys pay 4 gns., 1 gn. entrance.	£40.			2.
229. Llandeilo Cresseney.				£110.6.0., partly for school.	A u t h o r k n o w s n o t h i n g m o r e.							
230. Monmouth.	Temp. Jas.I	P.		£546.10.0, partly for almshouses, plus about £658.0.0.	?	Master takes pupils.	Free?	Pupils £30.	£120 and House.	As under (8).		None.
231. Usk.				£105.	A u t h o r k n o w s n o t h i n g m o r e.							
NORFOLK:-												
232. Aylesham.	1517.	P.			(Now conducted on Bell's System, not Classical? Open to inhabitants?)		Free?		£50 indep. of orig. endt.		Ca.100.	2 open.
233. Harleston.	1688.	P.		Orig.£54 p.a., plus int.on £200.					Whole endt? and House.			None (Not Classical
234. Hingham.				£176.								
235. Holt.	By Sir John Gresham.	P.		More than £55.	From town and its vicinity. Govt. and Patronage are in Fishmongers' Company.	Master takes 8 boarders.	Free?		£40 and House.			1, and 12 open.
236. King's Lynn.	Temp. Henry VII.	P.			Sons of Burgesses, for Classics only (none now on Foundation). Governed by Corporation of K.L.	Master takes boarders, also day sch. (No. fluctuates.)	Free.	Boarders 60 gns. Day sch. 4 gns.	Ca.£26 nett, and House.	As under (8).		6.
237. Norwich.	1547.	Cr.Co.	P.		Any no. of Sons of Freemen, sent by the Corp.(which controls.)	Both Masters may take pupils.	Free.	Optional.	£50 and House.			Some 20 - 30 shared with other schools and places.
238. Scarning.				90-95 acres.	Children of all residents in Parish (Engl. educ. only.)	No others.	Free.					Unknown.
239. Snettesham.				£87.								
240. Thetford.	Before 1566.	P.		Over £600.	Boys of the town (now 20 - 30). Also almshouse.	Master no longer takes pupils. 2nd Master does.	Free.	2nd Master's P.P. 28 gns.	£66.13.4.		20-30.	None.
241. North Walsham.	1606.	P.		£277.13.8	Sons of residents in 5 specified Hundreds, limited to 40.	Others, not defined (over 70). Master takes boarders.	Free.	P.P. 35 gns, and 3 gns. ent.	£100.	As under (8).	Ca.110.	None.
242. Little Walsingham.	Before 1572.	P.	P.	£72.10.0.					£72.10.0.			
243. Wymondham.	1559.	Cr.		(orig.£40).								1
NORTHAMPTON:-												
244. Aynho.	Temp. Jas.I.	P.			Inhabitants? Now on a small scale.	A few boarders taken by Master.	Free?		Orig.£20.			Preference to 2.
245. Blakesley. Nr.Towcester.		P.		£100 p.a.	Boys of Parish, for Classics. Now few want it, so Asst. appointed to give Engl. educ. (ages 7 - 14).		Free.					None.
246. Blisworth. Nr. Towcester.	Temp. Ed.VI?	P.							£11.			
247. Brackley.	1549.	Cr?	P.	Orig. 20 marks p.a. and 20/- p.a. plus int.on £500.								
248. Daventry.	1576.	P.	P.						Orig.£20.			
249. Findon. Nr. Wellingborough.	1542.	P.		£85.	Boys of Parish - orig. for Classics, but now for Engl. Educ. only. Ages usually 6 - 13.		Free except books.				40-50.	None.

SCHOOL	(1) DATE OF FOUNDN.	(2) ORIG. END.BY	(3) ADD.END. BY.	(4) AMT.END IN 1817-18 (Ca).	(5) NATURE OF FOUNDATION	(6) NON-FOUNDATIONERS	(7) AVERAGE EXPENSES OF FOUNDATIONERS	(8) AVERAGE EXP. OF NON-FOUND.	(9) MASTER'S SALARY.	(10) MASTER'S INC.FROM OTHER SOURCES.	(11) TOTAL NO. OF BOYS IN 1817-18	(12) UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENTS.
NORTHAMPTON (Contd.):-												
250. Fotheringhay.	Edw.VI? Henry IV?	Cr.		£20.	Boys of Parish for Latin, Seldom more than 2 - 4.	Master takes 12 boarders as well as his own sons.	Free.	32 gns.	£20?	As under (8).	16?	None.
251. Guilesborough.	1668.	P.		£160.	Boys of 4 Parishes, and any place within 4 miles. None now (overshadowed by Rugby).	None.	Free.		£160?		0	None.
252. Higham Ferrers.	1422.	P.(Abp.)			Boys of Parish, no longer Classics. (Engl. educ.)		Free.		£10.	£10 by Earl Fitzwilliam.		None.
253. Northampton.	1542.	P.	P.	£99.16.0.	25 Sons of Freemen, Latin & Eng. educ.	Boarders (30) and Day Boys (30) undefined.	Free.	Boarders 32-5 gns. Day boys 4-8 gns.	£33 and House.	As under (8).	85.	None (but many boys go to Univs.)
254. Oundle.	1556.	P.	P.	£403.	Apperently town boys (now only 3).	Master takes boarders (ca. 35).	Free.	Boarders 40 gns.	£100, less Usher's salery.	As under (8).	38.	2 open.
255. Peterborough.	Ca. 1540.	Cr.	P.		20 (8 nominated by Dean, 2 each by 6 Canons). Ca.1814 made chiefly Engl. educ.	No others mentioned.	Free?		£34.13.4 (Master & Usher in one.)		33.	2 open.
256. Preston Capes, Nr. Daventry.		P.		Capital £600.	Boys of Parish - now Engl. educ. only.		Free, except books.		£30.			None.
257. Rothwell, Nr. Kettering.	1581.	Cr.	P.	£9.14.0.	Never was Classical. Now 3 R's to 15 poor boys.		Free.		£9.14.0?		15.	None.
258. Towcester.	1553.	P.	P?	£38.11.6.	Boys of Parish.	Master takes pupils.	Free?	Boarders 20-26 gns.	£38.11.6.	As under (8).		None.
259. Wellingborough.	Temp. Edw.VI	P. (Townsmen)	P.	Ca.£80?	Boys of town and Parish for Classics, no. not limited.(But none at present) Under master teaches Engl. educ. to 30.	No others, but Under Master takes a few pupils.	Free.		£37.10.0. (sinecure).		30.	None.
NORTHUMBERLAND:-												
260. Allendale, Nr. Hexham.	1700.	P.			Children of Parish.		Paupers free. Others 1/- to 12/- p.a.		£55.10.0. incl.House.	As under (7).		None?
261. Alnwick.			P.	£20. incl. payments by Corp.	Sons of Freemen.	Master takes boarders.	Free.	Vary.	£20.			
262. Haydon Bridge, Nr. Hexham.	1685.	P.		£730.	Boys and girls of 2 villages. Classics and Engl. educ.	Master may take pupils.	Free.		£150 and House.		129 boys. 113 girls.	None?
263. Hexham.	1598.	Cr?	P.		Boys born in Parish. Classics and Engl. educ.	Others undefined. No p.p. (Ca.40).	30/- p.a.	?	£21.17.2½ and House.			None?
264. Morpeth.	1552.	Cr.		Ca. £240.	Sons of Freemen and of Free Brothers.(12).	Other day boys (50 total). There are houses for boarders, in one of which H.M. lodges.	Free.	D.B. £2.	2/3rd. of endt.	2/3rd.of (8).	62.	None?
265. Newcastle.	After 1533. Before 1600.	P.			Open to all.	No boarders now.	Free.		£120 and House.			3 shared 12 possible.
266. Rothbury.	1720.	P.			Now a national school for Poor. Not classical.	Other than poor.	Free to Poor.	Quarterage.	£50.			None.
267. Stamfordham. Nr. Newcastle.	1663.	P.		£220.	Engl. rudiments only, to poor of Parish.		Free.		£220 and House.			None.
NOTTINGHAM:-												
268. Mansfield.	1561.	Cr.	P.	£110 - £135, plus int.on £581.17.11.	Boys of Parish for Grammar (now none) Engl. educ. preferred and paid for.	Sub-Master takes pupils.	Free, except entrance etc.	Sub-M's pupils, 30 gns.	? and House.		"Few".	2 occasionally.
269. Newark.	1530.	P.	P.	£2000, only partly for school.	Boys of town, any no. "Madras System" used.	Undefined. Master takes pupils.	Free.	P.P. £34 and £40.	£220.	As under (8).		None.
270. Normanton.				£4.								Preference to 3.

SCHOOL	(1). DATE OF FOUNDN.	(2) ORIG. END.BY	(3) ADD. END.BY	(4) AMT.END.IN 1817-18 (ca.)	(5) NATURE OF FOUNDATION.	(6) NON-FOUNDATIONERS	(7) AVERAGE EXPENSES OF FOUNDATIONERS	(8) AVERAGE EXP. OF NON-FOUND.	(9) MASTER'S SALARY.	(10) MASTER'S INC.FROM OTHER SOURCES.	(11) TOTAL NO.OF BOYS IN 1817-18.	(12) UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENTS.
NOTTINGHAM:(Contd.):-												
271. Nottingham.	1513.	P.	P.	Was recently £461.1.7.	60 boys nomin. by Corp. - actually 55. apparently now Engl. educ. only.	No others.	Free.		£100 and House, but pays taxes on it.		55.	None?
272. East Retford.	1552.	Cr.	P.		Boys of Parish, Classics and English. (actually 30 - 40).	No others.	Free.		£80 and House.		30-40.	None.
273. Southwell.	Temp. Henry VIII?	P?	Cr.	£24.	Boys born in Southwell (usually about 12)	Master takes private pupils (at present 12)	Free.	P.P. 40 gns.	£24 and House.	As under (8).	12.	4.?
274. Tuxford.	1671.	P.		£48.14.0.	Boys of Parish, now Engl. educ. only. (now about 60). (ages 7 - 14/15).	Day boys undefined.(now ca. 20) Master willing to take boarders).	Free.	Day boys? Boarders 20 gns.	£40 and House.	As under (8).	Ca.80.	None?
OXFORD:-												
275. East Adderbury.	1589.	P.		(orig. 20 marks.)								
276. Steeple Aston, Nr. Woodstock.	1640.	P.			Boys of Parish, free if poor (30 - 40), now 3 R's only.	20 - 30 others.	Free if poor.		£17.10.0. and House.		Ca.60.	2 open.
277. Banbury.					Now ceased to exist.							
278. Burford.	1571.				Now totally gone to decay.							
279. Bampton.	1699?			£50.10.0.	Boys of Parish, now 3 R's only, because of Master's neglect (deputy teaches).							
280. Charlebury, Nr. Enstone.	1675.	P.			Boys of Parish, English and Classics.	Master takes 1 or 2 gentlemen to educ. for University.	Free.	?	£40 and House.			2 (small).
281. Dorchester.	1652.	P.			Boys of Parish (?) formerly 6, now 9, 3 R's only now.	Day scholars and boarders taken. (12 now.)	Free.	Day sch?. Boarders 18 gns.	£10, formerly £20.	As under (8).		
282. Ewelme.	Temp. Henry VI.	P.			12 boys for Grammar and singing, preference to boys of Manors belonging to Hospital but school has long ceased to exist.							
283. Henley	1605 Ca.1609	Cr. P.		Schools united 1778,£215.9.5. p.a. and £800 capital.	Parish - a Grammar and an English school, now united.		Free; 20 are to be clothed and apprenticed.					
284. Chipping Norton.	Temp. Edw.VI.	Cr.		Orig.£6, now payable out of Cr.Land Revenues.	2 boys nomin. by Bailiffs and Burgesses, for 3 R's and Classics, for 3 years each.	"All other boys". And Master takes boarders.	Free.	Day B.£1. Boarders 20 gns.	£15.4.0, House and garden.	As under (8).	42 - 72.	None.
285. Thame.	1558.	P.			Boys of Parish, Founder's Kin and Children of tenants on estates.	Master takes boarders under 12 yrs. (Limited no.)	Free.	Boarders 30 gns.	£40, out of which provides Usher if nec.	Is also Vicar. As under (8).		None.
286. Watlington.	1664.	P.	P.		20 boys of Parish. (Not Classical now) Recommended by Patron (for 3 years).	Other day scholars.	Free.	?	£20.	Is usually Vicar.		
287. Witney.	1663.	P.			30 boys born in Parish.	Master takes boarders.	Free, except 2/6 entrance.	Boarders 30 gns.	£10 nett, and House.	As under (8).	30?	None.
288. New Woodstock.	1585	P.			Sons of Freemen.	Master will take about 25 boarders, incl. Parlour Boarders.	4 gns Classics, 2 gns. 3 R's.	Boarders 25-30 gns. P.B. £40.	£30 and House.	As under (7) & (8)		
RUTLAND:-												
289. Oakham 290. Uppingham	Ca.1584.	P.		£2700	The boys of the respective towns, in so far as parents too poor to pay for them.	Boys of towns who can afford fees, and from other towns. M's house at O. can take 70 boarders, at U. 50.	Free.	Boarders 50gns. Boarders 40gns.	£105,House and garden. £105,House and garden.	As under (8). As under (8).		7 and 6 open. 7 and 4 open.
SHROPSHIRE:-												
291. Bridgnorth.	1503.	Co. (Munic.)	P.		Sons of Freemen and Burgesses Paying scot and lot, resident within Liberties. (usually 40 or less). Classics.	Master may take any no.of Private pupils.	Free.	?	£34? and House.	May take a Living.	Ca.40?	3.

SCHOOL	(1) DATE OF FOUNDN.	(2) ORIG. END.BY	(3) ADD END.BY	(4) AMT.END.IN 1817-18 (Ca).	(5) NATURE OF FOUNDATION	(6) NON-FOUNDATIONERS	(7) AVERAGE EXPENSES OF FOUNDATIONERS £	(8) AVERAGE EXP. OF NON-FOUND.	(9) MASTER'S SALARY.	(10) MASTER'S INC.FROM OTHER SOURCES.	(11) TOTAL NO.OF BOYS IN 1817-18	(12) UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENTS.
SHROPSHIRE (Contd.):-												
292. Donington, Nr. Shrewsbury.	1627.	P.	P.	£26.13.4?	40 boys, inhabitants of Wroxeter and Uppington; for Classics - but now only 2.	Master has at present 26 pupils.	Free.	Pupils £45 p.a.	£26.13.4. House and 6 acres.	As under (8)	2?	2.
293. Market Drayton.	1555.	P.	P.		Boys of Parish for English, Classics and Hebrew (now 61).	Boarders not excluded, but none taken.	Free.		£25 and House.		61.	None.
294. Halesowen.	Temp. Common-wealth.	Govt. Commission.		Ca.£130.	Boys of Parish for Classics (now about 40).	No others.	Free?				Ca.40.	None.
295. Ludlow.	1552.	Cr.	P.		Boys of Parish, no limit of no., Latin only. 4 others chosen by Bailiffs. (ages 9 - 16).	Usually 40 - 50 others. And Master takes boarders and "Parlour boarders".	Free.	Boarders 40 gns. P.B. 60 gns.	£80, House and Garden.	As under (8).		2.
296. Newport.	1656.	P.		£704.6.0.	Originally 80 from Newport and Chetwynd-end failing these from other specified areas. Now very far short of this no. If total no. more than 130, another Usher required.	"Very few others". But Master takes pupils.	2/6 entrance, otherwise free.	Pupils 60 gns.	£150, House and Garden.	As under (8).		4, and 4 open.
297. Oswestry.	Temp. Henry IV.	P.	P.		Boys of Parish, any no., for English and Classics. (now 12).	Now 50 others. Master takes pupils.	Free.	P.P. 40 gns.	£300, incl. House.	As under (8). and has 2 Livings.	62.	None, but many go to Univs.
298. Shrewsbury.	1551.	Cr.	Cr.P.	£2500 p.a.	Sons of Burgesses.(now/about 43-4)	Any that H.M. admits (now about 86-7)(Some board with 2nd Master).	Free.	Boarders 50 gns. Ent. 5 gns.	£300 and House.	As under (8).	130.	23.
299. Wellington	Before Edw.VI.	Unknown.		£4.17.6.	Now a large Charity School, chiefly supported by subscriptions; orig. endt. insignificant. (Non-Classical).							None.
300. Wem.		P.		"Nobly endowed".	A u t h o r k n o w s n o t h i n g m o r e o f i t.							
301. Whitchurch.	A u t h o r k n o w s n o t h i n g o f i t.											
SOMERSET:-												
302. Bath.	1553.	Cr.			10 poor boys of Bath.	Master unrestricted in admission. Has day boys, day boarders and boarders.	Free.	Boarders £50. Day boarders £30. Day boys £12.	£84 and House.	(8). Also 1 Living annexed, and a 2nd at present.	Ca.90.	None.
303. Bridgewater.	1561.	Cr.	P.		Boys of town and adjacent Parishes. (now uncertain if there are any Foundationers).	Boarders and day scholars.	Free?	Boarders £40. Day B. 8 gns.	£15.13.4.	As under (8).		None?
304. City Gr.Sch. Bristol.	1533.	P.	P.		40 Sons of Freemen.	Boarders and Day Sch.	Ca.£2 p.a.	Boarders ca. 50 gns.	£80 and House.	As under (8).	Ca.80.	8?
305. College Gr.Sch., Bristol.	A u t h o r k n o w s n o t h i n g o f i t.											
306. Redcliff Gr.Sch., Bristol.	A u t h o r k n o w s n o t h i n g o f i t.											
307. Bruton.	Refd. Temp. Edw.VI.	Cr.		£360-5.	Boys of Parish and specified adjacent Parishes (now 11).	Master may take boarders (now 1).	Free.	Boarders £60.	£80 and House.	As under (8).	12.	6.
308.Crewkerne.	Temp. Edw.VI.	P.							£80.			Prefsrence to 4.
309. Frome.	Temp. Edw.VI.	Cr.	P.	£1368.8.0. (partly for school)	37 boys in Charity School;(Gr. Sch. not given).							
310. Ilminster.	1550.	P.		£430 ca.	Boys of town and Parish - 2 schools, 1 grammar and 1 3 R's. Former usually 8 - 12 Free Scholars.	Master takes boarders.	Free.	Boarders - terms very.	£50 and another poss. £50, and House.	As under (8).	8-12.	Possible 4.
311. Langport.	1670.	P.		£70.	Boys of Town only. Only Founder's Kin free. (Town boys now 20 - 30).	Boarders. Day boys? (altogether ca. 50 now).	See under (5).	Boarders £25.	£70.	As under (8).	50-60.	None?
312. Martock, Nr. Ilchester.	1661.	P.			Sinecure - no scholars now.							
313. Taunton.	1522.	P.			Once great school, now empty.							

SCHOOL	(1) DATE OF FOUND'N.	(2) ORIG. END.BY	(3) ADD. END.BY	(4) AMT.END.IN 1817-18(Ca.)	(5) NATURE OF FOUNDATION	(6) NON-FOUNDATIONERS.	(7) AVERAGE EXPENSES OF FOUNDATIONERS.	(8) AVERAGE EXP. OF NON-FOUND.	(9) MASTER'S SALARY.	(10) MASTER'S INC.FROM OTHER SOURCES.	(11) TOTAL NO.OF BOYS IN 1817-18.	(12) UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENTS.
STAFFORD:-												
314. Brewood.	Not later than 16th Cent.	P.		£385.	No limitation.	Boarders taken by an outside person. Master also takes some.	Free.	M's boarders 45 & 50 gns. (incl.tuition) Others £25.	£256.13.4.	As under (8)		None.
315. Dilhorne.	A u t h o r k n o w s n o t h i n g o f i t.											
316. Lichfield.	Temp. Edw.VI.	Cr.	P.		6 poor boys (Natives, or sons of Natives?) instr. by Usher.	Day boys and boarders undefined.	Free?	Day boys, Master 8 gns. Usher 4 gns. P.P. 40-50 gns.	£170 and House.	As under (8)		None.
317. Newcastle-under-Lyme.	Ca. 1600.	P.	P.	£105.	Sons of poor Burgesses, no limit of no.	No others.	Free.		£105.			None.
318. Rolleston, Nr. Burton.	Ca.1520.	P.			Now Engl. only; "much neglected" because of small salary.				£10?			
319. Rudgeley	Unknown.			£300?	Parishioners, no limit of no., but at least 8 yrs. old.	Master allowed to take 20 pupils.	Free.	P.P. 60 gns.	£300?	As under (8)		None.
320. Stafford.	1550.	Cr.		Ca.£320.	Sons of Residents in the Borough, any no. (now 120) Less than 20 do Classics.	No pupils taken by present Master.	Free.		Ca.£212. (no House).		120.	None?
321. Stone.	1558.	P.		(orig. 20 marks.)	Now English educ. only.							None?
322. Tamworth	Refd. 1588.	Cr.	P.		Residents only - but very few now.	Master takes boarders.	4 gns. p.a. for 3 R's.	Boarders 34 gns.		As under (8)		1.
323. Uttoxeter.	1558.	P.		(orig. 20 marks.)	Inhabitants? Only 14 now, English and Commercial education only.	No others.	Free.					None?
324. Walsall.	1553.	Cr.		£400 and Coal Mines.	Boys of Parish, for Classics; and English School annexed.(National School too, or is this it?)	Master may, but doesn't, take pupils.	Free.		£170.	Chapel being erected, Master to be Minister of it.		None.
325. Wolverhampton.	1515.	P.	P.	£1163.	Sons of Residents (though this limitation not certain)(150, of whom 98 maintn. by Trustees).	Master can take 40 boarders, Usher 12.	Free (except books)	All Boarders 30 gns.	£500 and House.	As under (8).	Ca. 200?	2 to be founded.
SUFFOLK:-												
326. Beccles.	1713.	P.		£230.	None free now.	About 48, not defined.			£230?		Ca.48.	None.
327. Botesdale.	A u t h o r k n o w s n o t h i n g o f i t.											
328. Bungay.	Before 1591.		P.		10 boys, inhabitants of Bungay (at present only 1). Control vested in Emmanuel College.	Not defined. 10 or 12 day sch. Master can take up to 20 boarders.	Free.	Day Sch.14 gns. Boarders 40gns.	£180-200 if not exercised by a Deputy.	As under (8).	12+?	4.
329. Bury St. Edmunds.	Temp. Edw.VI.	Cr.	P.		Inhabitants (not only Natives) no limit, usually about 40. Governors must prevent intrusion of boys to whom Classical educ. no use. Called Royalists.	Called "Oppidans". Not defined. Also P.P. taken by Master. (25-30).	2 gns.p.a. and 2 gns.entrance.	P.P. 60 gns.	£60 and House.	As under (8).	130	6.
330. Clare.	1669.	P.	P.	£62.	10 poor boys, inhabitants of town of Clare (Endt. includes clothing 8 or 10 widows)	No others mentioned.	Free.				10?	None (not [illegible] Classical now.)
331. Hadleigh.					"Enjoyed by the lower classes of the Community" - who know about the Foundation.							
332. Ipswich.	Refd. by Henry VIII.	Cr.	Cr? P.		30 boys of the town, indiscriminately.	"Others, whose numbers fluctuate". And Master takes boarders.	Free? and are given 4/- for books.	For boarders terms "discretionary".	Ca.£50 and House.		More than 30.	8 (and 1 shared)
333. Kelsdale.				£349.12.0. (not all for school)	10 or more of poorest children of Parish, mostly Engl. educ., but Grammar if wanted.							Endt. may be sb applied.
334. Lavenham.	1647.	P.	P.		5 boys born in Parish or town, ages 7 - 14, chosen by Trustees.	"Other day scholars" - now 4. M. wants boarders (4).	Free.	4 gns. p.a. day scholars. Master wants £50 for boarders.	Orig. £21 and House.	As under (8).	9.	None.
335. Needham Market.				£105.								
336. Redgrave, Nr. Eye.	1651.	P.							£30.			6.
337. Stoke.	Soon after 1535.	P.			School has disappeared.				Orig.£10.			

SCHOOL	(1) DATE OF FOUNDN.	(2) ORIG. END.BY	(3) ADD. END.BY	(4) AMT.END.IN 1817-18 (ca.)	(5) NATURE OF FOUNDATION	(6) NON-FOUNDATIONERS	(7) AVERAGE EXPENSES OF FOUNDATIONERS	(8) AVERAGE EXP. OF NON-FOUND.	(9) MASTER'S SALARY.	(10) MASTER'S INC.FROM OTHER SOURCES.	(11) TOTAL NO.OF BOYS IN 1817-18.	(12). UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENTS.
SUFFOLK (Contd.):-												
338. Sudbury.	1491.	P.		£100.	Boys of Borough, at discretion of Patron (now 6). Ages 7 - 12. Engl.& Commercial educ., but Patron wants to extend to Classics.	Others, day sch.(40) and boarders (20).	Free.	25 - 28 gns. boarders.	None, but has house and garden.	As under (8).	66.	None.
339. Woodbridge.	1662.	P.	P.	£38.6.0 and premises.	10 boys, inhabitants "of the meaner sort". Mainly Engl. educ., but also Classical if wanted.	Other inhabitants, very few, "because don't require Classics". Also P.P., incl. some(4) prep. for College.	Free.	£3. p.a. day school, £35. P.P. (more for College prep.)	£37.5.0. and House.	As under (8)	10+	None.
SURREY:-												
340. Camberwell.	1615.	P.		?	12 poor ch. of Parish (not Pauper) and son of every eldest Ch. Warden.	All ch. of Parish of Camberwell. Free. (others may be admitted by Govs.)		Master's private pupils, 40 gns. board and tuition. (has 25-30).			More than 40.	None. (but Classics taught.)
341. Farnham.	Before 1611.		P.		None now.	?					"None on Foundn." (evidently no others.)	
342. Guildford.	First bequest 1509.	P.	Cr.,P.	£87.12.0.	Children of Liberty of Guildford (10 now).	Master can take private pupils. Free?		Master's P.P. 36 gns. under 14, 40 gns.over. (has 30-40).	£62.13.4.	Fees from P.P.	Ca. 45.	1 to Oxford. (£57 p.a.)
343. Kingston.	1561.	Cr.			Sons of Freemen of Kingston.	No others.	Free.		£30,House and garden.		4 or 5	None?
344. St.Olave's Southwark.	Refd. 1570.	Cr.		£1400.	Ch. of Parish of St.Olave.	No others.	Free.		£115 and house (and many other masters).	Nil.(Strictly forbidden to take anything)	Ca.250.	2.
345. St.Saviour's, (or.St.Mary Overey) Southwark.	1562.	P.	P.	£373.7.0.	Preference to Parishioners. Total not to exceed 100.	Master has private pupils.	£2. p.a. and £1 entrance.	?	£100 and House.	?	100? (plus 30 in writing school)	2.
SUSSEX:-												
346. Chichester Free School.	17?2.	P.			12 of Chichester, Harting and W.Wittering, C.of E. (Chiefly for sea service).	No others.	Free?		Orig.£20 and lodging.		12?	None.
347. Chichester Prebendal School.	Temp. Edw.IV.	P.		Little - very uncertain.	Youth of Diocese, but endowment doesn't provide anything for them.	H.M. admits boarders (16) at 60 gns. D.S. any no. at 8 gns.	No Foundationers in practice.	As under (6).	Insignificant.	As under (6)	Ca.40.	None.
348. Cuckfield.	Refd. 1528/9.	P.			Sons of Parishioners of Cuckfield - Balcombe. (None now, because few parishioners, don't learn Classics.)	Private pupils taken by Master.	Free (if any)	£30 p.a. paid by private pupils.	£28.8.0.p.a.	£30 p.a. for each private pupil.	Ca.55.	None.
349. East Grinstead.	1708.	P.		£41.	Parishioners, limited in no., now 25. (aged 6 - 12).	Any admitted by Governors.	Free.	6d. or 1/- a week.	£41.	Payments under (8)	65.	None (not Classical now.)
350. Horsham.	1532.	P.		Upwards of £400.	Parishioners of Horsham and neighbouring Parishes. (ages 8 - 14).	No others.	Free.		£110.	Master takes 2 pupils, training for Univs., 200 gns.ea.	60.	None.
351. Midhurst.	1672.	P.			Parishioners. Preferably wanting to go to Univ.	Apparently any Master accepts.	Free.	Incl. board, 50 gns.	£20.	As under (8).	Over 60.	None.
352. Rye.	Author knows nothing of it.											
353. Lewes (orig. at Southover).	1512.	P.	P.	More than £77.	12 nomin. by Earl of Chichester, preference to Lewes.	Apparently from anywhere.	Free.	Day boys 8 gns. Boarders?	£57 and 2 houses.	As under (8)	More than 32.	1 of about £15.
354. Steyning.	1614.	P.		(Affairs of School now in Court of Chancery.)								
WARWICK:-												
355. Atherstone.	1573.	P.	P.	£128 +	Sons of Inhabitants? Seldom more than 10.	M's House can take 25 boarders.	Free.	?	£110 and House.		10?	None.

SCHOOL	(1) DATE OF FOUNDN.	(2) ORIG. END.BY	(3) ADD.END BY.	(4) AMT.END.IN 1817-18 (ca).	(5) NATURE OF FOUNDATION	(6) NON-FOUNDATIONERS	(7) AVERAGE EXPENSES OF FOUNDATIONERS	(8) AVERAGE EXP. OF NON-FOUND.	(9) MASTER'S SALARY.	(10) MASTER'S INC.FROM OTHER SOURCES.	(11) TOTAL NO.OF BOYS IN 1817-18	(12) UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENTS,
WARWICK (Contd.):-												
356. Birmingham.	Refd. 1552.	Cr.	P.	£3,000	130 (sons of Inhabitants?) Classics. Subsidiary schools for others.	Master takes 12 p.p. 2nd Master 14, (other Day boys?)	Free.	42 gns. & extras.	£400 and House.	As under (8), and all Masters have livings.	150-160?	10, and 1 shared.
357. Coleshill.	A u t h o r	k n o w s	n o t h i n g	o f	i t.							
358. Coventry.	1546/73.	P.		£400.	Sons of Freemen (very few for last 20 years).	"Fforyners" must pay - but hardly any now. No P.P.	Free.	?	Ca.£200? almost sinecure.	Usual to appoint M. to a Rectory.		2 in practice, not legally. Also maintain no. of others.
359. Dunchurch.	1708.	P.		£90+	Children of Parish for English and Rudiments of Latin.	As Master pleases.	Free.	?	£90.			None.
360. Nuneaton.	1553.	Cr.			Boys of Parish, ages 9 - 14. (Usually 40-50)	10 - 20 others. Master takes pupils.	Free.	P.P. 30 gns.	£50 and House.	As under (8)	60 ca.	None. (Bonus to apprentices).
361. Hampton Lucy.				£150.	Now ABC School for Parish boys.							4.
362. Monk's Kirby.	Before 1625.		P.	£300	Inhabitants of 3 specified places - but school now shut up.		Free.		£20 - 30.		0	None.
363. Rugby.	1567.	P.		£2469.18.6.	Boys from within 10 miles of Rugby, Warwickshire only.	Others at Master's discretion. Master boards 50.	Free.	About £53 inclusive.	£113.6.8., plus £2 for every Foundationer, and House.	As under (8). Other Masters also board.	381.	14, soon to be 21.
364. Sutton Cold ield.	Ca.1519?	P.		Ca.£250.	Sons of Residents in Parish, for Classics only. (usually very few). By separate agreement with Corp., must teach 3 R's to 24.	Others undefined. Present Master doesn't take boarders.	Free.	?	£250 less expenses of Trust, and Asst's salary.		?64-74.	None, but many have been to Univs.
365. Warwick.	Ca.1540.	Cr.	P.	£2385, for many other uses besides school	Natives of town, for Classics only (Now only 1 or 2)	At present Master has no Pupils.	Free.		£75 and House.		1 or 2.	2 and 2 shared.
WESTMORLAND:-												
366. Appleby	1574.	Cr.	P.		6 nomin. by Governors. Others of Parish and adjoining township pay a little. Classics.	Strangers board in town - no boarders in school.	6 Free. Others small quarterage.	Board in town £36.	T o t a l a b o u t £300.		70-80.	5 and others open.
367. Bampton, Nr. Orton.	1623.	P.		Ca. £105.	From anywhere.	Master takes pupils.	Poor are free, others pay a little.	Board in town 16-20 gns. With Master board and educ. 30 gns. P.P.	T o t a l a b o u t £120.	(and as under (8)	Ca.40?	None.
368. Barton, Nr. Penrith.	1649.	P.	P.	£80+	Boys and girls of Parish.	3 or 4 others. Master takes boarders.	Free.	Boarders 40 gns.	£60 and House.	As under (8), also another £5.	Ca.63 boys?	None?
369. Brough.	1506.	P.	Cr.	£7.11.4. from King's Auditors.	Boys of Parish, at present Engl. educ.only.		Quarterpence.					None?
370. Heversham, Nr. Milnthorpe.	1613.	P.		Ca.£52.	Boys of Parish, free for Classics.	Master takes boarders.	Free for Classics.	Boarders 25 gns.	Ca. £52.			Ca. 6.
371. Kendal.	Temp. Edw.VI.	Cr.	P. Cr.		No limitation. Classics only.	No P.P.	Free?		Ca.£60.			Ca.8.
372. Kirkby Stephen.	1566.	P.			Boys of village and neighbourhood, not whole Parish; Classics and Engl.	No. P.P.	£1 p.a.		T o t a l ca. £40.		Ca.30.	Some, no. not stated.
373. Kirkby Lonsdale.	1591.	P.	P.	Orig. endt. Ca.£45; etc.	Children of Parish - Classics and English.	Master takes pupils.	£1 to 2 sockpenny	P.P. £25.	Ca.£100.	As under (7) and (8) and a living.	Ca.60.	4.
374. Lowther.	1638.	P.	P.		None.	All pay - Classics and Engl. No P.P.		16/- to 28/-	T o t a l £60.		Ca.40.	None.
375. Measand, Nr. Orton.	1711.	P.	P.		Boys and girls of village and adjacent townships.	None mentioned.	Free, except for gratuity at Shrovetide.		T o t a l a b o u t £42.		Ca 20 boys?	None?

SCHOOL	(1) DATE OF FOUNDN.	(2) ORIG. END.BY	(3) ADD.END BY.	(4) AMT END.IN 1817-18 (Ca).	(5) NATURE OF FOUNDATION	(6) NON-FOUNDATIONERS	(7) AVERAGE EXPENSES OF FOUNDATIONERS	(8) AVERAGE EXP. OF NON-FOUND.	(9) MASTER'S SALARY.	(10) MASTER'S INC.FROM OTHER SOURCES.	(11) TOTAL NO. OF BOYS IN 1817-18.	(12) UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENTS.
WESTMORLAND (Contd.):-												
376. Morland, Nr. Appleby.	1780.	Co. (Dean & Ch. of Carlisle)			Children of Township.	Others undefined.	Small quarter-pence.	Higher quarter-pence.	Total about £60.			None?
377. Orton.	1730.	P. (Subscr.)	P.		Sons and daughters of poor of 2 townships. Classics, Engl. etc.	Some board in town, and day boys who are not poor.	Free.	D.B. small quarterage. Strangers more.	About £28+	£30+	70-100 boys and girls.	None.
378. Ravenstonedale, Nr. Kirkby Stephen.	Ca. 1688.	P.	P.	Ca.£43.	Sons of inhab. for Classics. (Ca. 50 plus).	Others undefined.(10-12) Master takes pupils.	Free for Classics.	D.B. 4 gns. Boarders 30-34 gns.	Total Ca. £70, also P.P. and a Living.		Ca. 65.	None.
379. Thrimby.	1681.	P.			Sons of day labourers in 2 places.	Sons of other inhab., and strangers.	Free.	Inhab. small quarterpence. Others more.	Total Ca. £30.			None?
380. Waitby, Nr. K. Stephen.	1680.	P.		Ca. £40?	Boys and girls of 2 townships. Classics and Engl. educ.	Any others (8 or 10 now).	Free.	Quarterage.	Total Ca. £45.			None?
381. Winton, Nr. K. Stephen.	Temp. Chas.II?	P.	P.		None.	All undefined. Classical and Engl.		14/-.	£30-40)		Ca.30.	None?
WILTSHIRE:-												
382. Calne	1660.	P.			5 for Grammar, nomin. by Trustees in rotation; 30 for 3 R's (latter from Parish only)	Any others (now about 20 day boys). No boarders at present.	Free.		£50 and House and garden.		55.	2.
383. Marlborough.	1551.	Cr.			Children and Grandch. of Inhabitants.	Others pay.	Free.	?			50-60.	9.
384. City School, Salisbury.	Temp. Eliz.	Cr.		£26.1.8. by Auditors of Exchequer; and £25.	Boys of City, any no., recommended by Mayor. (Now seldom more than 3).	Day boys admitted, and Master takes boarders.	Free.	Boarders £40.	£26.1.8.	Lectureship of £25,		None.
385. Close School, Salisbury.	[illegible]	P.(Bp.)		£35 (from an episcopal fund?)	8 choristers, clothed, instructed in Latin and 3 R's, then apprenticed.	Day Boys and Boarders - have been 83.	Free.	Boarders £40.	£35? and House.	As under (8).	Ca. 90?	None.
WORCESTER:-												
386. Bewdley.	Temp. Jas.I	Cr.	P.		Children of Inhabitants for Classics, None now.	Master takes about 30 boarders.	(Free).	?	£30 and House.	?		None?
387. Bromsgrove.	Temp. Edw.VI	Cr.	P.	£7 p.a. from Cr.Land Rev.	12 boys taught and clothed, afterwards apprenticed. (not Classical?)							6 open, (rarely taken).
388. Dudley.	1562.	P.		£120, soon to be more than £360.	Boys of town, any no. for Classics. Master has adapted educ. to commercial requirements. (30 - 40)	Master takes 8 boarders.	Free.	Boarders 50 gns.	£100 (soon to be incr.) and House.	As under (8) and this one has a Living.	30 -40.	None, but many go to Univs.
389. Evesham.	Ca. 1540?	Cr.		£10 from Cr. Land Revenue.	Boys of Borough and Liberties, for Classics - but this Foundn. disappeared (salary too small) and it is now Nat. School, supp. by subscr. and £40 from Worcester Dioc. School.	See under (5).	Free.		£10 to Nominal Master, who holds 2 Livings.			None.
390. Feckenham, Nr. Droitwich.	1611.	Cr.	P.	£57?	12 boys nominated by desc. of one benefactor. 3 R's only.	Master's Deputy takes pupils.	Free.	Pupils 16-20 gns. Entrance 1 gn.	£27. M appoints Deputy.			6 open. Preference (rarely taken).
391. Hartlebury, Nr. Kidderminster.	Medieval.	?	P.	£453.4.11.	Boys of Parish (Ca. 20).	Sometimes a few day boys. Master takes boarders - now 32.	Free.	Boarders 50 gns. (With 2nd Master 25 gns.)	£66, House and Garden.	As under (8)	20?	6 open, (rarely taken).
392. Kidderminster.	Before 1637.	?		More than £250.	Boys of Parish for Classics; and on payment of 2/6 entrance to 2nd Master, 3 R's.	Master no longer takes pupils. Under master does, for 3 R's.	Free.	U.M's boarders, 20-25 gns.	£160.			6 open, (rarely taken).
393. Martley, Nr. Worcester.	1579.	P?	P.	£88.11.8.	Boys of Parish, for 3 R's, and Latin if required. (Has not been for some time)	M. has given up "his private school". U.M. takes fees from a few boys from neighbouring Parishes.	Free.		£60 to £70.		Ca. 25.	None, (not Classical)
394. King's Norton, Nr. Bromsgrove.	Temp. Edw. VI.	Cr.		£15 from Cr. Land Revenues.	15 or 16 boys of Poor Families in neighbourhood, nominated by Minister of Parish. Now 3 R's only.	20 - 30 others, who pay.	Free.	?	£45?	About £25 in Fees?	Ca. 40?	None.

SCHOOL	(1) DATE OF FOUNDN.	(2) ORIG. END.BY	(3) ADD. END.BY	(4) AMT.END.IN 1817-18 (Ca).	(5) NATURE OF FOUNDATION.	(6) NON-FOUNDATIONERS	(7) AVERAGE EXPENSES OF FOUNDATIONERS	(8) AVERAGE EXP. OF NON-FOUND.	(9) MASTER'S SALARY.	(10) MASTER'S INC.FROM OTHER SOURCES.	(11) TOTAL NO. OF BOYS IN 1817-18	(12) UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENTS.
WORCESTER (Contd.):-												
395. Rock, Nr. Bewdley.	Temp. Edw.VI?	Cr?	P.	£5.14.0. from Cr. Land Revenues.	? 1 until recently Classics lapsed, now restored for private pupils).	Master and his brother take pupils (now about 20) for Classics.	?	P.P. 30 gns.				None, but 1 recentl got one of the 6 open.
396. Stourbridge.	1553.	Cr.		£396.	Boys of town and Parish? For Classics only, consequently few (0 - 10)		Free.		£150 and House.		0 - 10	None.
397. Wolverley, Nr. Kidderminster.	1620.	P.		Ca. £200.	Boys of Parish (also Alms for several Parishes).				(orig. £20).			None?
398. King's or College School, Worcester.	1542.	Cr.			40 poor scholars. 10 nomin. by Deen, 3 by each of 10 Canons.	No others mentioned, but M's House can accom. 20-30 boarders.			£40 and House.	Has a Living from Chapter.	40?	6 open?
399. Grammar School, Worcester.	1561.	Cr.			12 boys, 2 adm. by each of 6 masters.	M. takes boarders, also day sch.	Free? & get 13/4 for books.	Boarders £40 Day Sch. 6 gns.	£21			10.
YORK:-												
400. Acaster Selby, Nr. Selby.	Before 1535.	P.		£8 from Cr. Land Revenues.								
401. Arksey.	A u t h o r	k n o w s	n o t h i n g	o f	i t.							
402. Batley, Nr. Leeds.	1613.	P.	P?	£133.10.0.	Boys of Parish - almost all for 3 R's only. (Ca. 50).	Undefined - less than 10. No boarders.	Free.	?	£110 and House.		Ca.60	None.
403. Bedale.	Before 1534?		P.		8 chosen by Rector and Vestry; now incr. to 60 - Bell's system (Classics dropped?)		Free.		£52.10.0.		60.	None.
404. Beverley.	Medieval?		P.		Sons of Burgesses, for Classics. (10 now).	Other day boys (30) and boarders (12).	£2 for Classics, 2 gns.wr. & arith.	Day boys 6 gns. Classics, £3.wr.& arith. Boarders £6 gns.& extras.	£100 and House.	As under (8), and sometimes Lectureship of Parish.	52.	12, and 1 possible.
405. Bingley, Nr. Bradford.	A u t h o r	k n o w s	n o t h i n g	o f	i t.							
406. Bowes, Nr. Greta Bridge.				£339.13.0.								1.
407. Bradford.	Not later than 1553.	?	P.		Grammar and writing schools open to boys of Parish.	No boarders.	Free.		£160. (no house).		88(Gr.)	1 in 5 yrs.
408. Cawthorne, Nr. Barnsley.	1639.	Cr.			6 Inhab. 3 R's only.	Other day boys and girls. No boarders. (3 R's only).	Free.	?	Orig. £13.6.8.		40 boys & girls.	None.
409. Coxwold, Nr. Easingwold.	1603.	P.		(Orig.£36.13.4.)	? Classics and Engl. taught together.							
410. Doncaster.				(Corp. pays Salary)	Sons of Freemen for Latin.		Free.		£60		Ca.45?	1 shared.
411. Drax, Nr. Selby.	1669.	P.							£30+			Vague.
412. Drighlington, Nr. Leeds.	1691.	P.			"Limited". Classics or Engl.	Master may take boarders.	Free.		£60 and House.			
413. Giggleswick, In Craven, Nr. Settle.	1553.	Cr.		Nearly £1,000.	Any no. from anywhere.	Boarders taken.	Free?	Boarders £30 - £150.				6.
414. Guisbrough, in Cleveland.	1561.	P.		£375.15.7½d.	No locality defined, but only 10 on Foundation.	15 day boys.	Free?	£1 (Day boys)	£50.		26.	None?
415. Halifax, or Skircoat.	1585.	Cr? P?	P.		Boys of Parish for Classics.	Day boys (40-50)? Master takes boarders.	Free.	Boarders, 35-40 gns. Day boys £2?				3 shared.
416. Hartford, Nr. Richmond.	A u t h o r	k n o w s	n o t h i n g	o f	i t.							
417. Hemsworth, Nr. Pontefract.	Ca.1546.	P.	None.	£150 plus occasional fines.	No local limitation stated - Classics only, but 3 R's taught for £2 or less.(60-70).	None mentioned.	Free.(£2 or less for 3 R's).			A Living of £80 attached.		None.
418. Heptonstall, Nr. Halifax.	1642.	P.		£70.								Endts. lost.

SCHOOL	(1) DATE OF FOUNDN.	(2) ORIG. END.BY	(3) ADD. END.BY	(4) AMT.END.IN 1817-18 (Ca.)	(5) NATURE OF FOUNDATION	(6) NON-FOUNDATIONERS	(7) AVERAGE EXPENSES OF FOUNDATIONERS	(8) AVERAGE EXP. OF NON-FOUND.	(10) MASTER'S SALARY.	(11) MASTER'S INC.FROM OTHER SOURCES.	(12) TOTAL NO. OF BOYS IN 1817-18	(13) UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENTS.
YORK (Contd.):-												
419. Hipperholme, Nr. Halifax.	1647.	P.	P.	£114.	Boys of Township and Constablery.	No others mentioned.	Free.					
420. Horton in Ribblesdale.	Ca.1725.	P.		£180.	Boys of Parish.	Day boys taken - boarding available in village.	Free.	At discretion (day boys).	£250-300, less Asst's. Salary.	As under (8)	70.	None.
421. Kingston upon Hull.	1486.	P.	P.		Sons of Burgesses for Classics (none) - these pay less for 3 R's. (30).	Others, undefined.(30). Also pupils taken by Master.	(£2 for Classics.) 4 gns. for 3 R's.	8 gns. for 3 R's. P.P. 60 gns.	£82.2.2½, and House.	As under (8), and Readership & Lectureship.	60.	2.
422. Kirk Leatham, Nr. Guisbrough.	1709.	P.		£150 + (School shares)	(No scholars left.)				£100 (sinecure)		0.	
423. Kirkby on the Hill, nr.Richmond.	1556.	P.		Ca.£1260.	(Concerns now in Chancery).				£210.			
424. Knaresborough.	1617.	P.	P.		Boys of Parish - but in practice these pay.	No boarders. Day boys?	Nominally free, actually pay.					None.
425. Leeds.	1552.	P.	P.		Boys of Borough and Parish, for Classics. (about 70).	No P.P. taken.	Free.		£500 and House.		70.	6 shared, and 1 every 5 years.
426. Linton, Nr. Skipton.				£30.								4
427. Old Malton.	1546.	P.		Ca. £100.	Any no. from anywhere - actually a few labourers' sons on Found., kept separate.	P.P. of Master - the only ones he teaches (they are very young).	Free.	About £40.				None.
428. Northallerton.	Medieval?	Cr?	P?		4 boys. Chiefly 3 R's taught.	Undefined, day boys.	Free.	Day boys 30/-	£4.13.6. and House.	As under (8)	Ca.40.	5 shared.
429. Penniston, Nr. Barnsley.				£100 (and int. on £200 for educ. of 8 poor girls)								
430. Pocklington.	1526.	P.		£1000- £1200.	Boys of Parish and others (now 2 or 3 of Parish, no others).	No others mentioned.	Not free.		2/3 of endt. ?		2 - 3.	3.
431. Pontefract.	1549.	Cr.	P.		16 sons of residents (2 nom. by Chanc. of Duchy of L., 14 by Corp.) 1 nomin. by Charity School.	Local day boys; also boarders in school, but not P.P.	1 Free.(Ch. Sch.) Others £1.1.0.	Day boys £2.2.0. Boarders at discretion.	Under £100 and House.		Ca.20.	? 1 and chance of 3.
432. Richmond.	1568.	P. (Burgesses).	P.	£330.	Boys born in Borough, or Sons of Burgesses or inhabitants in trade etc. (Ca. 20).	Undefined. Master takes a few boarders; Usher takes boarders.	Free.	Master's boarders 100 gns. Usher's from 58 gns.	£205 nett, no House.	As under (8).	50-60.	4 or 5 - very seldom taken.
433. Ripon.	1555.	Cr.	P.		Sons of Inhabitants, any no.	Day boys (boarded in town) and Master's boarders.	Free.	Boarders 40-50 gns.	£180 and House.	As under (8)		1 in 5 yrs - (right to be restored).
434. Rotherham.	1584.	P.			Boys of town, for Classics only.		Free.		£30 incl. House rent. (value of House)			1 and 3 possible.
435. Royston, Nr. Barnsley.	1607-8.	P? Cr?	P.		Boys of Parish - not enough doing Classics, so Engl. taught too.	?	Free.		£90.			None.
436. Scorton.	1720.	P.		£200 +	"All" for Classics (now none).	Pupils taken, and board obtainable in village.	(Free).	P.P. 50 gns.				None.
437. Sedbergh.		P.	(Author knows nothing more.)									11 and some possible
438. Sheffield.	1603-4.	P.		Was £35.4.0. in 1787; plus £12.12.0.	Boys of town and neighbourhood. (now 20).	Now 20 others (day boys?) No P.P. taken.			£60.		40.	None.
439. Sherburn	1619.	P.			8 boys nomin. by a Patron.	Others undefined (about 30). Master takes boarders.	Free.	Boarders £40.			Ca.38.	4 and 1 in 5 yrs?
440. Shipton, Nr. York.				£40.								
441. Skipton, in Craven.	1548.	P.		£600 +	Boys of Parish, any no.		Free.					2 and 1 in 5 yrs.
442. Thornton, Nr. Pickering.	1657.	P.		About £60 and buildings.	Boys of 5 places (usually 10 - 20).	Others undefined (few now) Master takes boarders.	Free?	Boarders Ca. £40.	£45, House and Garden.	As under (8)	Ca.20?	4.
443. Tickhill, Nr. Worksop.	Ca.1690.	P.			18 boys, Engl. educ. only.							

SCHOOL	(1) DATE OF FOUNDN.	(2) ORIG. END.BY	(3) ADD. END.BY	(4) AMT.END.IN 1817-18 (Ca.)	(5) NATURE OF FOUNDATION.	(6) NON-FOUNDATIONERS	(7) AVERAGE EXPENSES OF FOUNDATIONERS.	(8) AVERAGE EXP OF NON-FOUND.	(9) MASTER'S SALARY	(10) MASTER'S INC.FROM OTHER SOURCES.	(11) TOTAL NO. OF BOYS IN 1817-18.	(12) UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENTS.
YORK (Contd.):-												
444. Topcliffe, Nr. Thirsk.	Before 1588?	P?	P.		30 Poor children of Parish, chosen by Feoffees.				Over £80.			
445. Wakefield.	1592.	Cr?			Inhabitants.	Not mentioned.	Free, but give Master a Christmas present.		£130, and House(not enjoyed at present).		60.	4, and 3 possible.
446. Worsborough, Nr. Barnesley.				£5.4.2½ from Crown Land Revenues.								
447. Wragby, Nr. Pontefract.				£16.16. 4. from Cr. Land Revenues.								
448. Yarm.	1588.	P.	P.	[illegible]	14 poor ch. of Parish - at present Engl. educ. only.	Others. day boys (a very few do Classics) (now about 30).	Free.	?	£90-100.	Is also Parson of Parish.	Ca.44.	None?
449. Yoresbridge, Nr. Bainbridge.	1601.	P.			Children of 4 villages, for Classics. (are given Commercial education too).	Master takes pupils.	Free.	P.P. 24 gns.	Vary.	As under (8).	Ca. 50-70.	None.
450. York. (Holgate's Gr.Sch.)	1546.	P.										
451. York. (Horse Fair Sch.)	Temp. Philip & Mary.	Co. (Dean & Chapter).										
NORTH WALES.												
ANGLESEY:-												
452. Beaumaris.	A u t h o r	k n o w s	n o t h i n g	o f i t.								2.
CAERNARVON.												
453. Bangor.	1561.	P.	A u t h o r	k n o w s	n o t h i n g m o r e.							2 shared.
454. Bodtwnog. Nr. Pwllheli.					In such a poor state that it is seldom heard of.							
DENBIGH:-												
455. Denbigh.	A u t h o r	k n o w s	n o t h i n g	o f f i t.								
456. Llanrwst.					Endt. paid to Master, but no children taught.							
457. Ruabon.	A u t h o r	k n o w s	n o t h i n g	o f i t.								
458. Ruthin.	1598.	P.	Cr.		Boys of town.	Master takes boarders.	Free (except entrance.	Boarders 30 gns.	Ca.£200, less repairs to school.	As under (8).	Formerly 6, Ca.120?	and 4 possible.
459. Wrexham.	1728.	P.		£80.	20 Poor boys nomin. by Parson and Ch. Wardens from Lancastrian Sch.	Day boys and boarders undefined.	Free.	Day B. 6 gns. Boarders £30.	£80.	As under (8).		None?
FLINT:-												
460. St. Asaph.					Classical tuition of Choristers recently abandoned.							
461. Hawarden.	1609.	P.			8 chosen by Trustees.	Other day boys and boarders.	Free.	?				None.
MERIONETH:-												
462. Bala.	1712.	P.		£30.	30 poor boys of N. Wales, appd. by Master - 3 R's only.		Free.		£30?		30?	None.
463. Llanegryn, Nr. Dolgelly.	Ca.1647.	P.	P.	£100.	Unlimited, but not Classical.							
MONTGOMERY:-												
None.												

SCHOOL	(1) DATE OF FOUNDN.	(2) ORIG. END.BY	(3) ADD. END.BY	(4) AMT.END.IN 1817-18 (Ca.)	(5) NATURE OF FOUNDATION	(6) NON-FOUNDATIONERS	(7) AVERAGE EXPENSES OF FOUNDATIONERS	(8) AVERAGE EXP. OF NON-FOUND.	(9) MASTER'S SALARY.	(10) MASTER'S INC.FROM OTHER SOURCES.	(11) TOTAL NO. OF BOYS IN 1817-18	(12) UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENTS.
SOUTH WALES.												
CAERMARTHEN:-												
464. Caermarthen.	1576.	P.			6 sons of decayed tradesmen, nomin. by Corp.	62 others now. Master takes boarders.	Free.	Boarders 40 gns.	£45.	As under (8)	68.	4.
BRECKNOCK:-												
465. Brecknock.	1541.	Cr.										
CARDIGAN:-												
466. Cardigan.	1653.	Co. (Munic.)	P.		6 natives of town.	About 40 others. Master takes pupils.	Free.	D.B. 4 gns. B. 40 gns.		As under (8).	46.	None or 4?
467. Lledrod, Nr. Aberystwith.	1746.					Master takes a few pupils.		P.P. 35 gns.				
468. Ystrad Meiric, Nr. Aberystwith.	1774, or later.				32 children of Parish (school now united with that of Lledrod).							6.
GLAMORGAN:-												
469. Cowbridge.	Temp. Chas.II?	P.			5 boys nomin. by Master.	Master takes boarders.	Free?		£50.			5.
470. Swansea.	1682.	P.			20 sons of poorer Burgesses.	Master takes boarders.	Free.	Boarders 40 gns.	Ca. £57, and House.	As under (8)	Nearly 20.	None.
PEMBROKE:-												
471. Haverfordwest.	1614.	P.	P.		Sons of poor Burgesses. (10).	Others undefined (25). Master takes pupils.	Free.	P.P. 30 gns.	Ca. £105.	Other emol. about £100.	35.	None?
472. St. David's.					4 Choristers.				£14 from Chapter.			
RADNOR:-												
473. Presteigne.	1568.	P.		£150 or more.	Boys of township (very few).							
474. Rhayader.	1793.	P. (subscr).			Limited no. of poor children.							